This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

3 3433 06913055 1

THE

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY

AND

MERCANTILE LIBRARY NEW-YORK

GENERAL REVIEW.

174833.

THOMAS B. THAYER, D.D., Editor.

v. 28

NEW SERIES.—VOLUME VIII.

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

BOSTON:
UNIVERSALIST PUBLISHING HOUSE,
1871.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
972058
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1920 L

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1871, by the
UNIVERSALIST PUBLISHING HOUSE,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

CONTENTS.

Page.

ART. I. RELIGION IN ITS RELATION TO ART..... 5
By Prof. J. S. Lee.

ART. II. THE HEBREW NEW TESTAMENT..... 26
By Rev. W. E. Manley.

ART. III. BRITISH INDIA..... 40
BY David M. Balfour.

ART. IV. DR. WILLIAMSON'S RUDIMENTS..... 59
By Rev. T. J. Sawyer, D. D.

ART. V. ORIGEN AS A DEFENDER OF CHRISTIANITY.... 82
By Rev. R. C. Waltham, B. D.

ART. VI. THE MINISTRY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE WORK OF SALVATION..... 93
By Rev. S. Crane.

ART. VII. DR. WILLIAMSON'S RUDIMENTS..... 133
By Rev. T. J. Sawyer, D. D.

ART. VIII. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES,—EDWARD TURNER..... 151
By Rev. E. G. Brooks, D. D.

ART. IX. DR. PATTON ON UNIVERSALISM..... 180
By Rev. G. T. Flanders, D. D.

ART. X. MYSTERY AND RELIGION..... 213
By Rev. Giles Bailey.

ART. XI. JOHN MURRAY..... 222
By Rev. G. L. Demarest.

ART. XII. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES,—EDWARD TURNER..... 261
By Rev. E. G. Brooks, D. D.

Page.

ART. XIII. DR. WILLIAMSON AND HIS REVIEWER..... 289
By Rev. O. D. Miller.

ART. XIV. RECENT EXPLORATIONS IN PALESTINE.... 318
By Prof. J. S. Lee.

ART. XV. HISTORY OF THE DEVIL..... 335

ART. XVI. FREE RELIGION IN THE WEST..... 389
By Rev. A. D. Mayo.

ART. XVII. AFRICA: PHYSICAL, HISTORICAL AND ETHNOLOGICAL..... 412
By Rev. R. O. Williams.

ART. XVIII. THE SUCCESSFUL CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.. 427
By Rev. Richmond Fisk, Jr., D. D.

ART. XIX. OUR THREE-FOLD LIFE..... 443
By Rev. J. S. Barry.

ERT. XX. HUGO GROTIUS..... 460
By Rev. S. S. Hebberd.

ART. XXI. EDUCATION AT HOME AND ABROAD..... 469
By Rev. S. H. McCollester.

GENERAL REVIEW..... 102, 231, 360, 484

UNIVERSALIST LIBRARY NEW YORK ASSOCIATION

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY

AND

GENERAL REVIEW.

ARTICLE I.

Religion in its Relation to Art.

1. The Fine Arts in Italy in their Religious Aspect; Letters from Rome, Naples, Pisa, etc., with an Appendix on the Iconography of the Immaculate Conception. By Athanase Coquerel, Junior, Suffragan Pastor of the Reformed Church, Paris. Translated from the French. London.
2. Christian Iconography; or the History of Christian Art in the Middle Ages. By M. Didron, Secretary of the Historical Society of Arts and Monuments, Paris. Translated from the French. London.

THE question has long been discussed by critics whether poetry in its aim is designed simply to please, or has some subsidiary end in view. The same question has been mooted in regard to the kindred arts of painting and sculpture. Is it their aim solely to excite in the mind of the beholder the sentiments of beauty and grandeur, or to subserve, in addition to this, some ulterior object? Do they ever recognize the principles of morality or religion as legitimately entering into their design, or do they abjure these altogether? When the artist sculptures a figure or paints a picture representing some scriptural or theological subject, as St. Paul's Preaching at Athens, or Christ Descending into Purgatory, does he have in mind the æsthetic influence of his work upon the mind of the spectator solely, or does he design, also, to inculcate some religious lesson or teach some theological dogma? We do not propose to discuss these questions now, or dogmatically pass judgment upon them. But it seems to us, without enter-

ing into a metaphysical argument concerning them, looking at the subject simply as a matter of fact, that it can have but one answer.

Whether legitimately within his province or not, the artist does, in fact, sometimes, have a religious or theological object in view, and this object he strives to achieve when he takes his chisel or his brush and attempts to give his ideals a material expression. Some artists frankly acknowledge this to be their object, and some work under the direction of Pope or priest who employs them to give shape to a particular dogma of the Church. And writers on Art oftentimes represent him as executing a particular painting or piece of sculpture for the express purpose of embodying a specific religious or theological idea, and they criticise it as a failure or success, so far as it tends to the accomplishment of this purpose.

Our object in this article is to show that the moral and religious condition of the artist affects the character of his creations, and that there is an intimate connection between the theological tendencies of the age and the artistic creations of that age; and that while painting, sculpture and architecture have often served to quicken and deepen the religious sentiments of the soul, they have also been used as means of inculcating gross errors and perpetuating them in the Christian Church. Our object is not to decry art in its legitimate province, but to vindicate it and protest against its being abused and perverted into the support of false and unnatural dogmas, as Romanism and sometimes Protestantism have sought to do.

The work of Athanase Coquerel, the younger, the popular pulpit orator of the Reformed Church in Paris, was written with the professed object of showing that the Roman Catholic religion has injured art, instead of promoting it, by turning it from its legitimate province, and forcing it into the support of absurd dogmas totally opposed to the simplicity and purity of the Gospel of Christ. The prevailing idea is, even among Protestants, that while Protestantism is the true religion, yet Catholicism has somehow done more for art. But he says: "We let Roman Catholicism boast and brag unceasingly

about its alliance with art, and preach and write and print every day that the Papal Church is the foster-mother of the Fine Arts, and their only efficient support on earth. Now if this is true, Protestantism is decidedly inferior to Romanism, and decidedly in the wrong as to one of the noblest realms of mental activity, as to the use of one of the Almighty's most precious gifts. This I pretend to disprove." pp. 6, 7. He admits that "the judgment which he pronounces on the relation of Catholicism to art flies in the face of the general opinion." This idea that "Catholicism has possibly injured the arts as much as it has benefitted them," he says, "will, no doubt, appear paradoxical." But this matters not, if it is true.

He frankly acknowledges that Romanism has done much for art. No one can deny that its earlier and mediæval efforts were favorable to it. "Modern art was indeed cradled by Catholicism, but its brightness paled before the rekindled touch of antiquity; and since that time Catholic art has never ceased to grow weaker, and is every day hastening towards extinction." p. 29. With the Renaissance arose a false taste generated by luxury and pride, and stimulated by unnatural dogmas; and gross theological errors crept into the Church that calls herself "the mother and inspirer of the Fine Arts," and which has succeeded in making the world believe that she merits these noble titles.

To substantiate his position he deals not in speculations, but adduces facts, noted and studied on the spot by himself while on a tour in Naples, Rome, and Pisa, with occasional illustrations drawn from other parts of Italy and his native France. He derives his illustrations from the three departments of painting, sculpture and architecture. Though in some instances his descriptions are highly-wrought and somewhat exaggerated, he makes out quite a strong case against the Church. He shows that those who have had the matter in charge have despoiled works of art, exerted a deleterious influence over artists, and vitiated their works by tawdry ornament and gross conceptions. Artists themselves have

allowed a low and vitiated taste to guide them in their choice of subjects, the formation of their ideals, and the execution of their works.

M. Coquerel has a strong antipathy against the Roman Church. He has witnessed the evils she has wrought upon morality and religion in France and Italy, and this makes it necessary for us to receive with some allowance his criticisms on her character and acts. The thousands of Protestant admirers who have visited the cathedrals and galleries of Europe, drank in the inspiration of those splendid architectural piles, and stood in wondering admiration and awe before those inimitable creations of the artist, studied with increasing delight those faces beaming with heavenly glory, and hung with rapture over those blended colors which glow with empyrean beauty such as no language can portray, may utter an indignant protest against his judgment. But if three-fourths of these works are deficient in some of the essential qualities of art, or display little artistic skill, we must not allow our admiration of the other fourth to embrace the whole. Discrimination should be exercised. M. Coquerel does not pass a sweeping censure upon all creations of art made during the periods and in the countries in which Catholicism has prevailed. It has nourished numbers who have enriched art. Leonardo da Vinci, Lorenzo Ghiberti, Giotto, Brunelleschi, Michel Angelo, Raphael, Heinrich Arler, Titian and Rubens were true artists. No one can doubt this who has seen the Last Supper, stood in front of the Duomo in Florence, or gazed upon that inimitable dome rising majestically over this vast pile, or studied the bronze figures on the three doors of the Baptistery, witnessed the Transfiguration on the walls of the Vatican in Rome, taken that long walk through the aisles of St. Peter's, rambled around and through that splendid Gothic Cathedral, "a dream in marble," at Milan, bowed before the Assumption of the Virgin Mary in the Gallery at Venice, or the Descent from the Cross in the Cathedral at Antwerp. These are *chefs d'œuvre*, and no critic can deny it without losing his reputation. But they are not

Roman Catholic creations. They are not the products of one sect or one church, but of Christianity itself. They are the inheritance of the world. Some of these artists chafed under the bonds which the Pope and the Church put around them. The Pope could not make the great-souled Angelo a mere tool to do his bigoted work, and he dared not cast him off, for he could get no one else to do in the Vatican what this artist was able to do. Obstinate and infallible elsewhere, the great Head of the Catholic Church was obliged to yield here. So he finally let the artist have his own way chiefly, and the result is sublime creations, partly classic, partly Catholic, but not strictly confined to the rules and dogmas of the Church.

Thus while M. Coquerel loves art, and would not lose a single true inspiration generated by it, and welcomes her productions like the offspring of truth, wherever found,

"On Christian or on Heathen ground,"

yet he would not allow Romanism to assume to herself all the credit of giving to the world those immortal fruits of genius which grow up in spite of her bad taste and false standards of art, not as her offspring, but the inheritance of humanity.

M. Didron's work, unlike that of Coquerel, seems not to have been written in a partisan spirit, or with a specific end in view, but with the general purpose of enlarging the field of knowledge on the subject of Christian Art in the Middle Ages. M. Didron is undoubtedly a Catholic, but his denominational proclivities do not appear in his treatment of the subject except in this — he writes from the stand-point of the Catholic Church, and recognizes the doctrines which she holds, as that of the trinity, for instance, and uses the terms which she employs. This is a curious and unique work, occupying ground covered by no publication before it, though Mrs. Jameson, in her volumes on "Sacred and Legendary Art," "Legends of the Monastic Orders," and "Legends of the Madonna," published since, occupies similar ground, looking at the subject from the stand-point of Protestantism. Both write historically and artistically, and with pure love of the subject; but she deals more in the legendary, he with the

theological aspects of the theme. Didron's work consists of two parts: *first*, the Nimbus or Glory, which, though of Pagan origin, has from time immemorial been used as a symbol of divinity and applied to God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, angels, apostles, prophets, saints, and sometimes to allegorical figures; *second*, he treats of the History of God and the trinity, embracing the three persons of the Godhead, as held by the Catholic Church in successive ages, and developed in the arts of painting and sculpture. In the latter part he presents us with an important contribution to Ecclesiastical History as he traces the attributes of the Godhead and the idea of the trinity, and the progress of art in its bearing upon the development of these doctrines in the Catholic portions of Europe. The facts which he presents are valuable, and could not have been gathered except by a long and toilsome search among the monuments, tombs and inscriptions found in the churches, monasteries, palaces, catacombs, cemeteries, libraries, art galleries, cathedrals and public squares of Europe. That these monuments and other works of art dealing with Christian themes are numerous, far beyond the general opinion, is seen by the fact that the grand Cathedral of Milan contains in the niches on its walls more than four thousand statues and busts, besides frescoes, mosaics, and etchings on glass; that large churches, such as those in Chartres, Rheims, Paris and Amiens, are adorned with no fewer than two to four thousand statues in stone, and from three to five thousand figures painted on glass. Formerly there was not a church, however small, that did not contain from thirty to a hundred figures either in sculpture or painting. To these must be added the paintings and engraved illustrations to be found in manuscripts and books during the Middle Ages which were specially devoted to the practice of illuminating historical and theological works, and we shall greatly increase the number of the works of art during this period. Now, owing to the iconoclastic spirit and the ravages of war and time, the number may be somewhat less, yet we must see from these data that the works of art bearing directly on religious themes

must be immense, and the importance attached to them as means for developing the Christian sentiments very great. Hence a work of this kind must be of great interest to one who wishes to trace the progress of theological dogmas as developed in the Christian Church.

We do not propose to review these works, but we may use some of the facts to be found in them as illustrations of our theme.

The relation between the artist's inner life and his works is intimate. As the poet and the novelist portray the creations of their imagination, so do the painter and the sculptor reproduce the emotions and aspirations of their inner being. They strive, though with partial success, to represent the ideals of their souls, as in the case of the artist who, despairing of giving fit outward expression to his ideals, exclaimed, "Oh, that I could paint up to what I see!" If only base passion, selfish desire, or over-weening ambition fill the soul, the artist cannot put upon canvas, or carve in marble, any high or ennobling figures. He may not be positively immoral or licentious, yet if, like Michel Angelo in the great painting of Overbeck, "The Triumph of Religion in the Arts," in the gallery at Frankfort, he is simply *unmoral*,[1] and no glow of spiritual life or vision of heavenly beauty exists in his soul, his productions, though great works of art, must be wanting in those peculiar elements that enter into the divine life. Religious truth is "spiritually discerned," and if the artist is destitute of spiritual insight, he will fail in his efforts to reproduce it in all its fulness and purity.

Most of the religious subjects that adorn the walls of the palaces, the cathedrals, and the galleries of Europe, are not copies, but creations, whether they are scenes or faces. They are the highest conceptions of the artist, drawn from the few hints suggested by the scriptural narrative and the customs and habits and character of the people pertaining to the age

[1] In this painting, Overbeck has introduced three classes of artists, one looking up at a divine fountain; one looking down into an earthly pool; and Michel Angelo looking neither up nor down, but straight forward, to show that he is neither sensual nor devotional, but gloomy, ascetic, turning his thoughts inward upon his own soul.

in which the scene is laid, while the faces are almost wholly ideal representations, suggested by the traits of character exhibited in the acts of the person represented. For instance, we have no good reason for supposing that there is in existence a single copy of the face of our Saviour, or ever has been since artists began to paint it. Two portraits of him were found in the Catacombs at Rome centuries ago, and recently another has been discovered; yet these are not Christian, but Roman types, having little sentiment in common with that of Jesus as expressed in the Gospel narratives.

It is said that Leonardo da Vinci, in his fresco painting of the Last Supper on the walls of the refectory at Milan, after painting the faces of the twelve, from Judas, the gloomy cynic, full of envy and disappointed ambition, to John, the beloved disciple, expressed his utter inability to paint that of Jesus. But after some hesitation he was induced to make the attempt, and the result was what the majority of critics coincide in — that his is the best figure of Christ designed by human skill. "Grief has in that face an elevation and disinterested purity which I have nowhere else seen," says M. Coquerel. "Jesus suffers, not because his blood flows, or his body is tortured, but because *one of his disciples will betray him* — him, the Son of God. Divine pity for sin and holiest affection unworthily outraged bow down that sublime head, which breathes an inward goodness, a touching grace, and the most perfect moral beauty and religious sanctity. Resignation could not be sweeter or sadder."[2] That face, so full of meaning, came from Leonardo's soul. No artist who had not become imbued with the spiritual significance and blended devotion and firmness of Jesus' character, could ever have succeeded in painting so expressive a face.

On a recent tour in Europe, on the day following that in which we examined Leonardo's Christ, we visited the Brera Gallery, and saw paintings of the Last Supper executed by Bonifazio and Rubens. Their figures of Christ are far inferior to that of the former. In depth of meaning and spirit-

[2] Religious Art In Italy, p 193.

ual force these countenances bear no comparison with the unequalled work of Leonardo. In the different galleries and churches we visited we saw thousands of pictures and statues of Jesus, and they widely differ one from another. No two seem to be alike, unless the one has been copied from the other. Some are young, even boyish, sweet, tender, in their expression. Some are old, even venerable, full of gravity and sadness. Some are human; others divine. Some glow with spirituality and heavenly grace; others are worldly. Indeed, there are portraits of Jesus in the convents and churches which look more like gay, jovial men of society, or simply intellectual beings, than the Christ depicted by Luke and John; so that instead of inspiring reverence and devotion, they would call forth expressions of admiration like those of social, pleasant, beautiful young men of our own time. These portraits were the conceptions of worldly-minded artists, or copies from some good-looking Italian or Frenchman who sat as a model for the artist. The diversity of conception exhibited in these portraits suggests the necessity of the artist's being able to enter into the spirit of Christ, before he can paint him so as to inspire in the hearts of his followers that spirit of high and holy love which is excited by reading the matchless narratives of the Evangelists.

The tendency of religious sculpture and painting has sometimes been to materialize the mind of the worshipper. This is not necessarily so, but results from perverted faculties and erroneous views of the nature of worship. This is seen in the history of these arts in their relation to religious worship. Though we cannot note the exact time, yet it is believed that the introduction of paintings into the Christian Church took place before the close of the second century. The earliest ages of the Church witnessed no attempts at artistic decoration. They were too near the presence of Jesus and his apostles who had walked the earth, healed the sick, the lame, the blind, and raised the dead. The early Christians preferred to look upon them as beings of the past who had done this benevolent work. They had passed away, but their works

were still fresh in the minds of the spectators. But when all who had seen them in their objective life had passed away, and no material memorials of them remained, the followers of Jesus began to crave something to remind them of the departed worthies. They read the words of the sacred historian which seemed to present pictures of the incidents in the life of their Master, and the acts of the apostles, and they longed to see these pictures presented on canvas or carved in stone. But the antipathy of the Christians to pagan customs, perhaps, had its influence to postpone their introduction into the churches. They revolted against the idea of using the same kind of agencies which had rendered pagan mythology repulsive to them; upon the same principle that led the Jews to reject the food, or forbid worship in the groves, of their Canaanitish enemies, and induced our Universalist fathers to reject the means, even when safe and honorable, which the Orthodox made use of to promote their faith.

But the whole tendency of that early age was towards materialism. Society had not yet emerged from the spell of rude and barbaric splendor. A purely spiritual worship could not long be maintained. "The invisible truths of the new religion demanded some outward form of beauty which might be loved — of grandeur which might be venerated. Written or spoken words were too shadowy and vague. The multitude required not only to hear of heaven, but to see it." Thus we may suppose the uncultivated masses felt. They were credulous, not critical. They were blindly devotional. The cross was to them far more expressive than the exposition of a passage of Scripture, however clear. The figure of "Jesus crucified" was a kind of "mute preaching" which their souls required. Faces of the Virgin Mary, saints, and angels, full of heavenly beauty, spoke to them in louder tones than the most eloquent words of the Bible. "And even the gifted minds who in their watchings might look upon the heavenly glory, saw the vision of angels, or earth the abode of saints, would yet find aid to their higher and more abstract strivings in those art-creations, where purity of soul was made

visible to the eye through the beauty of form. Thus did Christian art set itself the task of giving to the angels their beauty and blessedness; to the company of the apostles, the fellowship of the prophets, the army of martyrs, their dignity, inspiration, and fortitude; and thus having made heaven glorious, the Christian architect built upon earth a church worthy of the worship of that God whom the heavens cannot contain." [3]

We must bear in mind that a large portion of those who attended the Christian church in these ages were unable to read, and could not learn their religious lessons from the Bible. The services of the sanctuary consisted of devotional exercises more than sermonizing. Expository preaching was but little known. To remedy this defect, images and paintings were introduced into the churches. John Damascenus thus speaks in their defence: "Images speak; they are neither mute nor lifeless blocks, like the idols of the pagans. Every painting that meets our gaze in church, relates, as if in words, the humiliation of Christ for his people, the miracles of Mary, the deeds and conflicts of the Saints. Images open the heart, and awake the intellect, and, in a marvellous and indescribable manner, engage us to imitate the persons they represent." [4] Didron also says: "A sculptured arch in the porch of a church, or a historical glass painting in the nave, presented the ignorant with a lesson, the believer with a sermon, which reached the heart through the eyes instead of entering at the ears. The impression, besides, was infinitely deeper; for it is acknowledged that a picture sways the soul far more powerfully than any discourse or description in words." [5]

The first specimens of Christian art were rude and imperfect. Some of the earliest creations were in the catacombs and convents, by persons unskilled in art, yet who felt the inspiration of Christian truth, and sought to express it in forms and symbols. Most of these were allegorical or historic, as Moses drawing water from the dry rock, the cross,

[3] *Blackwood's Magazine.* [4] Quoted by Didron, p. 3. [5] Christian Iconography, p. 6

the dove, the raising of Lazarus from the dead, the good Shepherd calling or carrying the sheep, Jonah cast overboard, but finally saved, Daniel in the lions' den, the symbolic fish and the anchor, the birth of Christ, the miracle at Cana of Galilee, the adoration of the wise men. These paintings, mostly poor frescoes, and the rude bas-reliefs which were carved upon coarse granite or limestone that formed the walls of the narrow and gloomy passages of the catacombs at Alexandria and Rome, stirred up the courage of those martyr saints almost literally buried there in those caves of the earth. Their souls were fired anew with fortitude and zeal when they gazed upon these rude representations and symbolical sketches, encouraged and sustained in their fierce struggles with outward and inward foes. So numerous and varied are these works of art, that when the catacombs, which constituted at once "the house, the church, and the sepulchre" of the early Christians, were opened, behold, "an interred Christianity" was exhumed, and historians still go there to find materials for their works.

But when the arts progressed and the productions of more skilful artists began to adorn the churches and convents, the worshipper seemed to lose sight of the spiritual significance of these works of art, and to worship the beautiful symbol rather than the invisible beings symbolized. Thus the services of the sanctuary became sensualized and debased, which reacted with terrible effect upon the soul of the devotee. Then the thunders of the emperor and the bishop were uttered against the sacrilege, and the fell spirit of iconoclasm was violently aroused. Men, moved by the sight of professed Christians bowing down before images of wood and stone as substitutes of the invisible Father and divine Redeemer, rushed forth and tore down paintings, broke in pieces images of Jesus and his mother Mary, of prophets and apostles, saints and angels, and declared that the church edifice should be freed from these stumbling-blocks in the way of the Christian life.

In the year 726, the Emperor Leo, the Isaurian, issued his

edict against the worship of the images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the saints; and a few years later another edict commanded the total destruction of all images, and the white-washing of all walls adorned with paintings.[6] The people were so enraged that in many places they resisted the execution of these edicts; and in Constantinople the imperial officer who ascended a ladder for the purpose of removing the statue of the Saviour, which had the reputation of working many wonderful miracles, was hurled down by enraged women and beaten to death with clubs. Riots, tumults and wars followed. The grand Council, consisting of three hundred and forty-eight bishops, which assembled in Constantinople in the year 748, declared against image-worship. The Emperor Constantine, who succeeded Leo, fought against it. But after his death, the Council again assembled in Nicæa and abrogated the decree against images, and permitted their use in the churches as aids in divine worship.

Theophilus is called "the last of the iconoclasts," but the contest was not fully settled even with his death in 842. His widow, Theodora, is represented as having restored the Virgin to her throne as "the Mother of God" and "Queen of Heaven." After this, sculpture was prohibited in the eastern churches, and only paintings allowed; while in the western, both were again introduced. The Greek Church, to this day, prohibits all sculptured forms except bas-reliefs, and inculcates the idea that the flatter the surface the more orthodox the figures. In this the Mohammedans imitate the Greeks, allowing no sculpture in their mosques.

Art has done much to materialize and perpetuate popular and erroneous conceptions of religion. Probably most persons conceive of God and angelic beings only in human form. They seem to have no realizing sense of a spirit except as clothed in flesh. They, in their imagination, embody in human shape that which really has no shape nor form. Reproduce this idea in marble or on canvas, and the effect is debasing. Yet artists do this, and thus perpetuate a gross error.

[6] Milman's Latin Christianity, Vol. ii., pp. 308-9.

What a profusion of celestial beings clothed in earthly forms, and brought down to the comprehension of low and depraved minds, is seen throughout all the principal Catholic cities of Europe! Take Rome, for instance. In the Vatican, St. Peter's, the churches, the palaces, the public squares, the galleries, along the sides of the streets and around the fountains, and in the public gardens, you see a multitude of the different orders of angels, cherubim, seraphim, archangels, some on heavenly, some on earthly errands; painted, pasted on walls, carved, put up in niches, and in the corners, along the corridors, the naves, and the aisles. The inhabitants of heaven, clothed in the forms and tints of men and women, with wings of birds, and moving familiarly among the inhabitants of earth — this, instead of ennobling our conceptions of those pure and sinless beings, tends to debase them.

So of the attempt to represent, in material form, God, the Almighty, whose presence fills the immensity of space. It is not merely a blunder; it is a sacrilege. It should be our aim, as far as possible, to conceive him as wholly spiritual, pervading all his works; but this confining his being to the dimensions of a venerable old man with bald head and white beard and flowing locks, surely does not aid in accomplishing this aim. Jesus was a divine being who once walked the streets of Jerusalem, roamed over the hills and through the vales of Galilee, "going about doing good," performing wonderful works, a man among men, manifesting the passions, feelings, attributes of men; and it is proper, therefore, to represent him in a material form. But this is done with so much frequency that we fear the design is lost upon the mind of the worshipper. With our Heavenly Father it is different. He is too exalted, and pure, and holy, for mortal eyes to gaze upon. "No man hath seen God at any time." Yet the artist, in obedience to the behests of a corrupt taste, tries to bring such a Being within the limits of canvas and paint! Surely this is "limiting the Holy One of Israel" in a more direct and palpable manner than did the ancient Jews. It is materializing the Fountain of all life and spiritual excellence,

and making a God like those who worship him. This is a desecration of art, as well as an injury to religion, against which we cannot too strongly protest. It adds nothing to the excellence of Titian's magnificent painting of the Assumption of the Virgin, in the gallery at Venice, to place the eternal Father above in the figure of a venerable old man, holding out his hands as if to bless and receive the Virgin Mary rising so gracefully in the clouds towards heaven. She is the most prominent figure, and He, in the background, is a positive blemish in the painting. No one would recognize him without being informed who he is.

The early Christians dared not represent the Father on canvas, in bodily form. They conceived of him as Jehovah, the all-holy and glorious; and their minds were so filled with awe when contemplating him, that they could have no thought of making a representation of him in a form which could be cognized by the senses. Didron says that no portraits of him appeared before the twelfth century.[7] Before this, his presence was indicated by a hand issuing from the clouds or the sky; afterwards an arm, with rays or a nimbus around it, the fingers open to express his willingness to bless the world; sometimes in the act of bestowing a benediction upon his children; sometimes holding out a triumphal crown for the Son; sometimes conducting souls to heaven. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, he appears as a human face issuing from the clouds; then a bust; and finally a full length figure of a man. This exhibits the gradual process by which the idea of the Infinite became materialized. It was done in deference to the ignorance, the superstition and error of these ages. Art was demoralized and Christianity debased by the perverted spirit of the worshippers.

But the absurdity of using material things to represent purely spiritual beings culminated in the attempt to express the inexpressible dogma of the trinity. "Artistic Illustrations of the Trinity" immediately succeeded the efforts to materialize the Father. The doctrine itself cannot be com-

[7] Christian Iconography, p. 201.

prehended by the human mind, much less rendered intelligible by human language; yet the fanaticism of the dark ages attempted to make it manifest by material expressions.

When the Father began to be represented in paintings and sculptured forms, the figure of the Son appeared with him, at first the two being exactly alike, sitting or standing; afterwards slightly differing in features, one holding a globe, the other a book, with the dove, to symbolize the Holy Spirit, between them. The Holy Spirit seems to have appeared in a bodily shape, though it was at first presented as symbolic or allegorical; then the innocent features of a child's face; finally, the full form of a child and a man. He was less honored than the other persons of the Godhead; fewer churches being dedicated to him than to the Father, and fewer to the Father than to the Son. This would seem to indicate that the Son was more honored than either of his associates in the trinity. The Holy Spirit is sometimes represented as the personification of wisdom or intelligence; the Son, that of love and self-devotion; the Father, that of strength and creative power. While the Holy Spirit is expressed by a white dove, Satan and evil spirits are expressed by black images, to indicate their malevolence and subtlety.

At first, then, the three persons were represented separately; but when the attempt was made to combine them in a single group to express the trinity, it was found more difficult. This was not done, however, until a late period in the history of the church, as the doctrine itself was not fully developed in the earlier periods. Of course, no material representations could be made until it was established as an element in the creeds of the church, for these are only outward expressions of the soul's belief. Consequently we find no distinct groups of the trinity on the tombstones in the catacombs. The first representations were a triangle, three leaves of clover growing from one stalk, or three branches growing from a single trunk of a tree. Then the Father and Son were represented as a duality of persons. At first the Son was accompanied by a dove, to represent the Spirit; a

hand, or a hand and an arm stretching out from the clouds towards him, to represent the Father. The Son, too, is sometimes represented by the image of a lamb, or a cross, though these were not grouped with the hand and the dove. At length a trinity of persons appears, as in a piece of French sculpture in the sixteenth century — the Father, a venerable old man, sitting, with a tiara on his head; Christ, with a cross, sitting on his right hand; and the Holy Spirit, with a dove on his breast, sitting on his left. Sometimes the three persons are similar in appearance, of equal height; sometimes the Father, sitting in the middle, is a little taller, or otherwise distinguished as superior. Varied were the figures and emblems used to represent the dogma in the course of successive periods. Three heads and three bodies separate, then conjoined together, three heads resting on one body, three faces under one head — these were some of the modes adopted to represent it, until the rude and grotesque forms became so offensive, not only to artistic taste, but to religion, that the Pope interfered and forbade such representations of the trinity.

In this brief sketch we are led to see the injurious influence of the Church on art. Allowing that the doctrine of the trinity is true, clearly taught by the sacred writers, we cannot but regard it as unfit to be reproduced in material forms. Instead of attracting, it repels the intelligent worshipper. But when we look upon it as an incomprehensible idea and a mathematical absurdity, we must regard the attempt as audacious. And the variety of changes which the figures underwent to express the idea, from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries, confirm our statement. No wonder the grossness of the representations could not be endured, even by a Pope who was not over-nice in his tastes. Hence his prohibition.

It is interesting to trace the changes in the artistic representations of religious themes as indicating changes of sentiment in the church. Mary appears first as the mother of Christ, simply a woman, with a sweet, expressive, smiling

countenance. Afterwards her countenance assumes a sterner aspect; she is held in reverence; then she is worshipped, and the sentiment of maternal affection disappears.[8] She is placed on a throne, a crown upon her head, and crowds bow before her; even her Son worships her. Again she worships her Son. Both sit on a throne together. Both wear the crown. Both receive the homage of Christians. And she becomes immaculate, pure, and holy, free from the impurities of earth, until her holiness culminates in the dogma of the immaculate conception, proclaimed by Pope Pius IX., Dec. 8, 1854; a statue in honor of which event was placed upon a tall pillar, near the Piazza di Spagna, in Rome, in Sept., 1857. The Virgin stands there crowned, one hand raised towards heaven, the other pointing towards the earth, to indicate her mediatorial office.[9] Such are some of the inconsistencies of the Roman Catholic Church. To-day, scarcely any practice of this church is more generally and rigidly observed than the worship of the Virgin Mary as co-equal with Jesus.

Again, let us notice the changes in the figures of Christ. At first, a beardless youth, a young man; then a bearded man of mature expression and benevolent countenance. At first full of tenderness, in the tenth century he appears with a stern countenance, in the character of a Judge, as he had previously appeared in the character of a Saviour, a Shepherd, healing the sick, restoring the lost ones, raising the dead. In the fifteenth century he becomes the "Ecce Homo," crowned with thorns, blood trickling down his face, with a remarkably sad and downcast countenance. Christ nailed to the cross is seen everywhere in Catholic countries, in all forms from the rudest to the finest specimens of art; and Pietas, or dead bodies of Christ held by his mother Mary, his body descending from the cross, in the tomb, rising from the dead, and scattering the soldiers in dismay; and finally ascending in glory to heaven. While we would not object to representations of him in his offices of mercy and salvation on earth,

[8] See Milman's History, pp. 493-4.

[9] Coquerel, App. pp. 229—267. Mrs. Jameson's Legends of the Madonna, Introd.

his resurrection and ascension, as embodying truths dear to the hearts of all Christians, we cannot but look upon those representations of him in the character of a stern and relentless Judge as contrary to the teachings of the sacred oracles and injurious to the interests of religion.

Yet the galleries and churches are full of such scenes. Take, for instance, the picture in fresco of the Last Judgment, by Michel Angelo, which covers a space of thirty by sixty feet in the Sistine Chapel of the Vatican at Rome. And to show that it is not mere sectarian prejudice that dictates our judgment, we will describe it in the words of one whose theological sympathies are different from ours. Says Hillard:

"The attention is naturally turned to the principal figure — that of the Saviour — and in what character does he appear? Not in that of the Consoler, the Redeemer, the Reconciler, but in that of Judge; and not merely so, but an iron-hearted, almost a vindictive Judge, a Minos, or a Rhadamanthus, rather than Jesus of Nazareth. His arm is lifted as if to strike a blow. The figure, too, is brawny and coarse, and the attitude, which is neither sitting nor standing upright, wants both dignity and grace. On the other hand, the Virgin, who stands next to him, is a figure highly expressive of tenderness, sympathy, and compassion, and is admirably drawn." Mr. Hillard expresses his regret that "Michel Angelo should have devoted so many years of his life to a subject of this class, which must lose its expression and significance as religious ideas grow more and more spiritual. A pictorial representation of the Last Judgment degrades a mental conception into a visible scene. When we bring to the aid of art the analogies drawn from earthly courts of justice; when we express immortal power by mortal frowns and gestures; when we spread over the canvas a world of muscular and struggling limbs, with exulting fiends and angels blowing trumpets, with distended cheeks, — we may have done something for painting, but certainly nothing for religion or spiritual elevation." [10]

Here is seen the debasing influence of religious error on art. The coarseness of execution evinced in the figure of Christ is due to the unnatural conception which the artist

[10] Six Months in Italy, Vol. i., pp. 257—260.

had of his character. When he is drawing a repulsive scene, too, he is impelled to do it rudely, while he draws a pleasant one with genial grace. This attitude of Christ in the painting, in our estimation, spoils it. Many of the figures are drawn finely, though we cannot say much in commendation of the demons and condemned spirits below. The painting has been greatly admired by most persons who have studied it. Yet here is an "enacted falsehood" in the character of the principal figure, and the effect is most disastrous upon those who are seeking to realize the true character of Jesus as the Redeemer of the world. It strikes terror into their hearts which paralyzes, rather than a wholesome fear which restrains and is consistent with a grateful and tender love. No wonder that a French sculptor, when he had seen the picture in the Vatican, exclaimed, "I have seen Michel Angelo, and he is terrible!" How unlike the tender, mild, affectionate Raphael, who delights not in monstrosities, terrors, dragons, hydras and chimeras dire, but who loves to paint the Madonna in all her gentleness and grace, and Jesus and John engaged in their benevolent mission, as "gentle messengers who glided from heaven on a sunbeam with tidings of mercy and love." We tremble before the creations of the one. We are drawn with irresistible attraction towards the lovely creations of the other. Raphael's Transfiguration is a genuine product of Christianity, while the Last Judgment is an excrescence, the product of a perverted faith.

The two kinds of religion of which these two artists are the types, as expressed in their works, may be further illustrated by an anecdote of Luther. His wife asked him why it was that in the Romish Church there is so much and such fervent prayer, while the Protestants are very cold and careless in their praying. The reformer, in his bluff manner, replied, "The devil drives them to pray." The one is a religion of terror and constraint; the other, the religion of freedom and love.

In other galleries and churches, we often meet with paintings and sculptures of Christ in the terrible character of

Judge, and they all indicate the degradation of art. On the arch over the central door of Notre Dame, in Paris, is a bas-relief representation of the Last Judgment. Christ is surrounded with angels. Two swords issue from his mouth. His feet rest upon the earth. In his left hand he holds an open book. At his feet is a dead body eaten with worms, coming out of the tomb between the disciples John and Stephen, who are interceding for him. We read, above, the inscription, "The terrors of death have frightened me. The torrent of my iniquities has overwhelmed me. I am only a worm of the earth, and not a man." What a picture this, bearing the Christian name, on a Christian church, to teach our children the truths of the Gospel!

So in the gallery at Frankfort-on-the-Main is a fresco by Cornelius, representing the Father on the throne, and Jesus, with sword in hand, driving sinners down to hell. This tendency of theology to represent itself in rude and barbaric splendor, bringing into prominence its harsher and darker features, peculiar to the mediæval ages, and not yet wholly effaced from the creeds of the churches, is seen in bold relief in the Campo Santo at Pisa, in Italy. The paintings are hung on the walls of those extended corridors. "There they are with manners strange, barbarous, and poetical, shameless and devout, by turns; their knights and noble ladies reäppearing in the dress of the times down to its minutest details; their monks with all that profusion of devilries and miracles which the age cherished: their cruel theology in which Jesus Christ is an angry Judge; Satan, a brasier in human shape, red-hot and of gigantic size; the demons unclean, hideous and absurd-looking executioners." Death is represented in the most frightful colors. The artists who wrought these figures seemed to have no conception of the tender affections and humane feelings that distinguish human beings from demons. The sinner is a candidate for eternal suffering. God is the angry Ruler. Jesus is the unappeased Judge, yet capable, at times, of being moved to pity. And "the difference between angels and demons is only that which exists

between the constable who arrests the criminal and the executioner who flogs or tortures him." In view of such exhibitions, well does M. Coquerel exclaim, "If God is charity; if Christianity is love; if moral holiness is its end, and pardon through Christ the means; this is quite a different religion from that of the Campo Santo, which is more like Judaism, except, indeed, in the added complications and terrors of an unfeeling and dogmatic creed." [11]

We doubt very much whether such paintings as are seen in Pisa and Rome are in the interest of art, as they belittle and degrade the mind of the artist. Viewed in a religious light, they pervert our conceptions of spiritual things. They embody gross errors which would sooner pass away before the light of truth, if they were not traced in marble or on canvas. Art, doubtless, being so mixed up with irrational dogmas, will prolong the existence of the Roman Catholic Church. In saying this, we do not discard religious art. In reproducing scriptural scenes and characters, the tenderness of our Saviour, the sacrifice on the cross, the devotion of David, the firmness of Paul, the love of John, the boldness of Peter, the fortitude of the martyrs, the zeal of the early Christians, the purity of the saints, and the joys of Paradise, they make us more devotional, fill our souls with a holier love, draw us more towards Christ as our spiritual Redeemer, and inspire us with a firmer faith and a loftier zeal. A pure system of Gospel truth alone will give us the highest style of art.

Article II.

The Hebrew New Testament.

In the January number of the *Quarterly* for 1869, we published some criticisms on the Modern Greek Testament, as approved and circulated by the American and Foreign Bible

[11] Religious Art in Italy, pp. 161-2.

Societies. It was made apparent that, while in general that version is unexceptionable, there are words and passages that were evidently rendered under the influence of sectarian prejudice. More recently we have devoted some attention to the Hebrew New Testament. The copy we have has the following statement at the foot of the last page: "Printed for the London Society, at the Operative Institution, Palestine Place, Bethnal Green, London, N. E." It bears date 1867. It was obtained at the "Bible House" in New York City.

It is evident, from the above circumstances, that this version has the sanction and approval, both of the American and London Bible Societies. It is the version that is sent out and distributed among the Jews, in all parts of the world, by the missionaries of the Evangelical denominations, both in England and America. By its influence, it is hoped that the children of Abraham will be converted to the Christian religion, and instructed in the principles of the Gospel.

The examination of this version has given us great pleasure, as we find much to approve, and but little to condemn. And the renderings which we do not consider correct, are probably essential to its being countenanced by those who are most interested in its circulation. It is worthy of note, that the renderings which we pointed out as sectarian, in the modern Greek Testament, are not found in the Hebrew version.

The translation of the Greek Testament into the Hebrew language, is made comparatively safe and easy by the aid of the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Old Testament. Being a translation of Hebrew into Greek, this version is in general a safe guide in translating Greek into Hebrew. Some allowance must be made for the differences between the Old Testament and the New; but as these differences are not great, they do not materially affect the result. The Greek of the Septuagint, and that of the New Testament, are not essentially unlike; and the idiomatic forms are the same in both. As a general rule, the same Greek words that are common to them may be rendered into Hebrew conversely, as the Hebrew was rendered into Greek by the Seventy. This makes the

work comparatively easy. The translator who follows this guide will not make any great mistakes. The danger is with words that are used in the New Testament in a different sense from what they have in the Septuagint; and words that occur in the former, but are not found in the latter. The great mistake we find in the Hebrew New Testament, is with a word of this kind. It will be noticed in its proper place.

The following are the most important words that occur in the New Testament. They take their importance from their connection with fundamental theological doctrines. By noticing the translation of these, in the version now before us, we can judge best of the character of the work.

1. *Psuche* (Ψυχὴ). In the English version this word is translated *life* and *soul*, in about the same number of passages each, the latter preponderating to some extent. The corresponding Hebrew word is *nephesh* (נֶפֶשׁ). This word is translated by *psuche* in the Septuagint; and the latter is rendered by the former, in the Hebrew New Testament. It was not necessary to vary the rendering, according as the word might seem to denote the life or the soul, after the manner of the English, the modern Greek, and other versions; for the Hebrew word has the same peculiarity of expressing these two meanings, that belongs to the Greek word. This is evident to all who have traced its usage in the Old Testament.

2. *Pneuma* (πνεῦμα). The predominant rendering of this word in our version is *spirit*. It denotes what we call the immortal part of our nature. To a certain extent, it is synonymous with *psuche*. It is not easy to tell in what particulars they agree, or in what they differ; and yet we know that, besides the common ground which they occupy, each has ideas that are peculiar to itself. The Hebrew *ruah* (רוּחַ) is as uniform a representative of *pneuma*, as *nephesh* is of *psuche*. In the Septuagint, and in the Hebrew New Testament, one stands for the other.

3. *Diabolos* (διάβολος). This term, rendered *devil* in most places where it occurs in the English, is, in the same passages, and with the same exceptions, rendered *satan* (שָׂטָן) in the

Hebrew. In 2 Tim. iii. 3, and Tit. ii. 3, the translator of the Hebrew New Testament has imitated the English version, in rendering the word by one that signifies *slanderer*, *false accuser;* literally, one who makes a bad use of his tongue. In Rev. xii. 12, and xx. 10, the word is *satan*, though the form is slightly changed.

The Hebrews, reading satan for diabolos, will naturally give it the meaning that belongs to the term satan in the Old Testament. This, we suspect, will do little towards establishing, in their minds, the doctrine of a personal devil. Thus it is easy to see how much better Christianity is when presented to the Jews in the ancient Hebrew language, than when presented to us in our modern English. This view will be more fully confirmed as we advance.

4. *Daimōn* (δαίμων). This term, which in the English is rendered *devil*, and thus confounded with diabolos (though the meaning is quite different), is rendered into Hebrew, *shēd* (שֵׁד), denoting a *demon*, or a departed spirit. In one instance only the term is perverted, as in English, by the rendering of *ēl*, *god*. The passage is Acts xvii. 18, "He seemeth to be a setter-forth of strange *gods*."

Paul was addressing the people of Athens. His subject was Jesus and the *Anastasis*, or Resurrection. These names were mistaken for the spirits of the dead, whom, as they supposed, Paul was recommending as objects of worship. As they did not recognize such names as these on the long catalogue of deities worshipped by the nation, they concluded that he was introducing *strange* or foreign deities; and as this was a capital offence, they brought him before their highest tribunal, with a view to his condemnation and death. The history is familiar, and need not be repeated. Suffice it to say, that, while a true rendering of this word, in the passage before us, would have given us much valuable information concerning the opinions and worship of the Athenians, the present rendering introduces confusion and absurdity.

5. *Hadēs* (ᾅδης). This word in the Septuagint is nearly always the representative of the Hebrew *sheōl* (שְׁאוֹל); and

the latter stands for the former in the Hebrew New Testament. Here the rendering is uniform, though our English version gives the word as *grave* in 1 Cor. xv. 55, and *hell* in all other passages. Thus the author of the Hebrew version has taken this term entirely out of the hands of those that would use it to sustain a favorite but false doctrine. The Jews, understanding *sheol* in the New Testament according to its usage in the Old, can never attach to it the sense of *hell*, as this latter term is now generally understood. They will of necessity regard it as denoting the *grave*, or state of the dead, without regard to the goodness or badness of its inmates, their happiness or misery.

If the parable of the rich man and Lazarus be looked upon as an objection to this view, it is so, only so far as parable differs from poetry. If the poetic imagery of Isaiah and Ezekiel, setting forth the transactions of *sheol*, can be made to harmonize with the meaning of the term, as grave or state of the dead, surely no one need be embarrassed with this one parable of Jesus. No Jew can take this passage in any other sense than as a parable; for in any other sense it would contradict the Hebrew Scriptures. Whatever condition is denoted by *hades*, in this passage, it must be one described in the Old Testament; for the rich man is expressly informed that his brethren have Moses and the Prophets, and can obtain from them all needed information about his place of torment. The conclusion is, that this passage teaches no place of punishment but such as is revealed in the Ancient Scriptures.

This is another instance of the improved system of Christian doctrine given to the Jews in the Hebrew New Testament. This version takes one of the strongest passages of the New Testament by which men attempt to prove future punishment, and brings it into harmony with the Law and the Prophets, according to its own teaching; and so takes it out of the hands of those who have perverted its language to an unworthy purpose.

6. *Gehenna* (γέεννα). This word, in the Greek, is an abbreviated form of *ge-hinnom* (גֵּי־הִנֹּם), and is uniformly ren-

dered *hell* in the English version. In the Hebrew New Testament it is very properly rendered *ge-hinnom*, and is thus at once divested of all those terrific images that attach to our word *hell*.

In the same manner, and to the same extent, that *ge-hinnom* represents punishment in the Old Testament, will it be understood by the Jews as representing punishment in the New Testament. If they follow the safe rule of interpreting Scripture by Scripture, and making the Old Testament the expounder of the New, they will be compelled to restrict the term to temporal judgments. Few persons would ever have obtained any other idea from this word if it had been left untranslated, or given to us in the Hebrew form, as in the version before us, or translated according to its literal import. It is very plain that the word is rendered *hell* in our version — not because this term properly represents the original — but because the translators feared that its figurative application would be overlooked by the reader, if they did not interpose to prevent it. Therefore, in their great anxiety lest a mistake of this kind should occur, they laid aside, for the time being, the character of *translators*, and assumed that of *expounders*. The result has been as unfortunate as it was wrong in principle. It is gratifying to see this important word rendered back into Hebrew, according to its literal and proper signification. It is indeed divested of all those terrific ideas that have long been attached to its Greek and English representatives; but this should not be objected to, since it is divested of nothing that properly belongs to it. It is thus farther evident that Christianity, to the Hebrews who learn it from the version of which we are speaking, is quite a different system from that which we derive from the English version. With us, *hell* is a place of endless punishment — with the Hebrews, *ge-hinnom* has no such meaning. Indeed, the Hebrew language has no term that expresses this idea. And were it proper to render *gehenna* into the Hebrew, by some term denoting a place of endless punishment, we know of no word that could be used for this purpose. It would be necessary to employ some form

of circumlocution to reach the object. In view of this fact, we know not whether we ought to commend the impartiality of the Hebrew New Testament, or congratulate ourselves that the version is correct from necessity. It is certain that the author has removed from his version one of the strongest supports of the Orthodox faith, whether the result is due to necessity or choice.

If it be said that *ge-hinnom* means the same as *gehenna*, namely, hell, a place of endless punishment, having acquired that sense after the close of the Old Testament canon, and before the time of Christ, let those who make the assertion produce adequate proof, and we will admit that this was the meaning when the word was used by the Saviour. Such proof has never been adduced, and we believe it never can be. We must judge of the word by its Scriptural usage; and there is no such usage that will warrant the sense given to it in our English version. And usage that is not Scriptural (if it were ever so abundant, as in fact it is not) will have but little weight with honest and candid Hebrews. We may well congratulate them, therefore, that the Christianity which we offer them is more consistent and rational than that which we keep for ourselves.

7. *Tartaros* (τάρταρος). The translator of the New Testament into the Hebrew language could find no term answering to *tartaros* in the Greek. So he used the word for *destruction*, as coming nearest expressing the same idea.

In the mythology of the Greeks, *tartaros* was a part of *hades* — the part occupied by the wicked. Thus, while the Hebrew *sheol* answers to *hades* in the Greek, there is no Hebrew word for *tartaros;* making it evident that the idea of a separation in hades, and a place there for the punishment of the wicked, is of heathen origin.

8. *Katakrino*, *katakrima*, etc. (κατακρίνω, κατάκριμα, etc.). The translation of these terms by *damn*, *damnation*, etc., gives them a terrific and forbidding appearance, that does not naturally belong to them. This is evident to all who can trace their usage in the original. It is only in a few instances that

they are rendered by these terms. These words are properly rendered into Hebrew by terms that mean *to judge*, *to condemn*, *judgment*, *condemnation*, etc. These latter are the terms more commonly used in the English version.

Damnation is a theological term; and it expresses an idea for which there is no suitable word in the Greek or Hebrew Scriptures. The sacred writers had no such idea; and therefore had no need of a word to express it. The origin of the idea, and of the terms by which it is expressed, has its date this side the Christian era. The proper rendering of the New Testament into the Hebrew takes from it every idea of this nature.

9. *Aiōn*, *kosmos*, *oikoumenē* (*αἰὼν*, *κόσμος*, *οἰκουμένη*). The last of these words occurs fifteen times in the New Testament, and is uniformly rendered *world* in the English version, and as uniformly rendered *tēbēl*, *world*, in the Hebrew.

Aion occurs one hundred and twenty-one times, and is once rendered *tebel* (תֵּבֵל), Eph. ii. 2; once *ad*, 2 Cor. ix. 9; once *olam* and *ad* combined, Heb. i. 8; and in all the other instances, *olam* (עוֹלָם). *Aionios* is rendered, in the Hebrew New Testament, five times by *netsah* (נֶצַח); and all the other times by *olam*. It occurs, in all, sixty-seven times.

Kosmos, which in our version is translated *world*, and properly so, is rendered, singularly enough, in the Hebrew New Testament, sixty-nine times *tebel*, *world;* twice *erets* (אֶרֶץ), *earth;* and one hundred and four times *olam* — in all a hundred and seventy-five times.

The common rendering of *olam* and *tebel*, for *kosmos*, is the strange thing to be accounted for in the otherwise excellent version now under review.[1] Plainly, the author meant to convey the idea that aion and kosmos are in general synonymous terms. The one he translates olam, in nearly all the places where it occurs; the other he translates olam, in a great majority of cases. But that they are not synonymous

[1] How nearly alike these terms *olam* and *tebel* are in the Hebrew; and how suitable (?) to use both as the rendering of aion, may be inferred from the fact that they *are never rendered into the Greek of the Septuagint by the same term!* The first is nearly always rendered aion, the last oikoumene.

— that they differ widely in signification — is known to all who read the original, and may be to any who will give the least attention to the subject.

It is not possible to attribute this rendering to ignorance; and the only solution that seems at all admissible, is, that it was made with design, and from motives of policy or interest. There are passages of Scripture where kosmos and aion occur, that can be made to subserve the interests of the evangelical creed only by the identity of these two terms. The translator knew this fact, and "governed himself accordingly." How the mis-translation of kosmos is made to subserve sectarian ends, will be seen before we get through. But here we would call the attention of the reader to the circumstance that, of the two words, aion and kosmos, the latter could be mis-translated with the greater safety, for a reason before given, namely, that the usage of this term in the New Testament is quite different from that of the Septuagint. In the Septuagint, kosmos occurs frequently, but nearly always in the sense of *ornament;* but in the New Testament it has unequivocally the sense of *world*, there being but one instance of the usage with the other signification.[2] It is not kosmos, but aion, that has the most immediate connection with the Orthodox faith; but to give that a wrong rendering was not so safe, since its frequent occurrence in the Septuagint, and the analogy of its usage there with its usage in the New Testament, furnished the means of detecting and exposing the fraud. But kosmos could be practiced upon in this way with comparative safety. And the same result is reached; for rendering kosmos and aion by the same Hebrew term, conveys the impression that they are synonymous. And as kosmos is the more fixed and settled in its signification, the tendency is rather to elevate aion to the position of kosmos, than to bring the latter down

[2] Besides the sense of *ornament* attached to kosmos in the Septuagint, it is used in the sense of *host*, in the phrase "host of heaven." Gen. ii. 1; Deut. iv. 19; xvii. 3; Isa. xxiv. 21; xl. 26, etc. In the Apocrypha the sense of *world* began to be attached to the term. 1 Mac. vii. 9, 23; viii. 18; xiii. 14; Wis. vi. 26; vii. 18; ix. 3, etc., etc.; though it also has the meaning of *ornament*. In the New Testament it is used almost exclusively in the sense of *world*. It has no affinity with *olam* of the Hebrew, or *aion* of the Greek.

to the position of the former. *This is the desired end;* and the method made use of to accomplish it has at least the credit of being *ingenious*, if not *ingenuous*.

Very few things, in the way of biblical exegesis, are more desirable to the evangelical denominations, than to fix the definition of *world* to aion, and thus make it equivalent to kosmos. This being accomplished, the sin against the Holy Ghost is not forgiven, either in this *world* (aion) or in that which is to come. Matt. xii. 32. The disciples, on the Mount of Olives, are made to inquire about the end of the *world* (aion); and of course what follows has reference to the final consummation of this world's affairs. Matt. xxiv. 3, etc. The parable of the wheat and the tares is made to apply to the end of the physical universe, and not to the end of the *age*, as some of the best scholars have understood the passage. Matt. xiii. 37–43.

The modern Greek Testament is made to subserve the sectarian purposes of the evangelical church in one way; the Hebrew New Testament does the same thing in another way. The former takes out aion from Matt. xiii. 38, 39, etc., xxiv. 3, and puts kosmos in; the latter leaves aion in, and renders it correctly by the Hebrew *olam;* but it renders kosmos *in the same way*, and so conveys the impression that the former means the same as the latter!

The Hebrew New Testament has olam for aion, in Matt. xii. 32, which speaks of the sin against the Holy Ghost. It distinguishes properly between kosmos and aion, in the parable of the wheat and the tares, Matt. xiii., rendering one tebel, and the other olam. It does the same in Matt. xxviii. 20, Mark xvi. 15, and Heb. ix. 26. It gives us olam for aion in Matt. xxiv. 3; and in verse 14 it has tebel for oikoumene; but in verse 21 it renders kosmos by olam!

Usage is the only true standard by which to determine the meaning of words. There are a few passages where aion is so far synonymous with kosmos as to admit the same rendering, without doing violence to the sense. In a few instances in our version, the rendering is the same as that of kosmos;

but a large proportion of these would be better rendered *age*, or by some similar term. The most that can be claimed for the resemblance of these words, is, that in a very few passages *world* is the proper rendering of both; but when this is the case, it will be seen that the meaning is not alike; some modification of *world* being obvious in the one, and another and different modification in the other. When *world* means the outward physical universe, the word is always kosmos—when it means the people of the world, the inhabitants of the universe, it is kosmos. When *world* means a certain order or constitution of things, such as belongs to the present mundane system, the word is aion. When it means society with its customs, habits, sins, etc., the word is aion. The close observer will always detect a radical difference, even where they come the nearest together.

That there is an important difference in the meaning of these words, is more clearly manifest from their usage in those passages where they are brought near together, in the same sentence or paragraph. Take Matt. xiii. 38, 39, etc., as an example. "The field is the world" (kosmos) . . . . "the harvest is the end of the world" (aion). If the last sentence refers to the end of the material universe, as is claimed, why was the word changed? In this case the word kosmos should have been repeated. The use of aion here makes it evident that the end referred to is not the end of the field, kosmos, but the end of the age. The nature of the parable also requires this view. It is not at the end of the *field* that the farmer reaps his harvest, but at the end of the *season*. As the same field has many seasons of harvest, one succeeding the other, so kosmos has many successive aions. Hence it is that this word is found only in the singular; while aion is found alike in both numbers.

The difference between these words is likewise evident, from their usage in Matt. xxiv. The end of the aion, referred to in the question of the disciples (verse 3), is associated with the Jews as a nation, and with their institutions. The reference by Jesus to the destruction of the temple, in chapter

xxiii., induced the disciples to make some remark in his hearing about the buildings of the temple, and the immense stones of which it was composed. This gave rise to the marvellous announcement that one stone should not be left upon another, that should not be thrown down. Then comes the question, "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the aion?" There is no allusion to the world, or outward universe; nor to anything not immediately connected with the Jewish nation. What follows confirms this view; for when the end inquired about should really come, the disciples are told that they must *flee to the mountains*. And further along, it is said, in reference to these events, "This generation shall not pass away, till all these things be fulfilled."

The other two words, kosmos and oikoumenē, are used in this passage very differently. "This Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world" (oikoumenē), verse 14. "There shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world" (kosmos), verse 21. The first of these embraces all nations, or the known world; the last is the material universe. The difference between these words and aion, is as clear as the light of day.

Again, the use of kosmos and aion, in the language of Jesus, when about to leave his disciples and ascend to the Father, shows the same diversity. "Go ye into all the world (kosmos), and preach the Gospel to every creature." "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (aion). The extent of meaning, in the first instance, is indicated by the expression "every creature"; the limitation of the term, in the last instance, is clear from its exclusive reference, apparently, to those to whom the language is addressed.

Finally, the passage in Hebrews ix. 26, places the question of difference between these words beyond the reach of cavil or doubt. In the use of kosmos there is a reference to the "foundation of the world," meaning, without doubt, the physical universe. In the use of aion, there is allusion to the providential dispensations of truth under the divine govern-

ment. The coming of Christ, "to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," terminated one dispensation (aion) and introduced another.

From these examples, it is evident that the false renderings of which we are speaking are without excuse, on the part of the translator. But having rendered Matt. xii. 32; xiii. 38–40; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 20, etc., in such a way as might seem favorable to a liberal theology, he seeks to guard against this construction by investing aion with the meaning of kosmos in other passages. We cannot help thinking that it is a little remarkable for the same Society to approve and circulate the modern Greek Testament, with the renderings we pointed out as partial and sectarian; and the Hebrew New Testament, with very different renderings! Surely such a circumstance demands an explanation; and we know of none that seems more probable than the one we have suggested.

We will notice one thing more, connected with our subject; and with that will close this article. It cannot have escaped the notice of intelligent persons, that the doctrine of endless punishment is supported mainly by passages taken from the New Testament. Indeed, many of the most learned men of the Orthodox school admit that the Old Testament does not teach the doctrine. It is clearly revealed, however, they tell us, in the New Testament. But the strongest passages that are ever adduced from the New Testament to prove the doctrine, are rendered into Hebrew by no other terms than such as are found in the Hebrew Old Testament. If these terms do not teach the doctrine in the Old Testament, how can they teach it in the New?

To illustrate by examples, the words most relied upon in the received text of the Greek Testament, to prove the endless perpetuity of punishment, are *aion* and *aionios*. These are translated into Hebrew, in nearly all cases, by *olam*. In the few instances where other terms are used, the sense is the same. But if olam does not denote the endless duration of punishment in the Old Testament, how can it do this in the New? Hades is rendered sheol in the Hebrew version; but

if the latter does not denote a place of future misery in one part of the Bible, how can it in the other? Ge-hinnom is the rendering of gehenna, in this version; but ge-hinnom is a Hebrew word that is found, not unfrequently, in the Old Testament. It does not there denote a place of future punishment, and it cannot denote such a place when found in the New Testament.

These remarks are designed for that class of Evangelical Christians, clergymen and others, who do not find the favorite dogma of endless punishment in the Hebrew Scriptures; but are devotedly engaged in the circulation of the New Testament, in the Hebrew language, among the Jews throughout the world, expecting them to find there the doctrine in question, expressed in the use of terms which, in the Old Testament, have no such meaning! Plainly, this view involves an absurdity. The only consistent theory is, that the Old Testament does not teach the doctrine; nor the New Testament, either in the Greek or Hebrew. All the passages that have the appearance of teaching it in the English, or in other modern versions, come of the prejudice and sectarian bias, consciously or unconsciously, felt by the translators. If the Hebrew version is free from this blemish (and we think it is, in spite of the error we have pointed out), the fact is due — not to those most interested in its circulation, but to the circumstance that the Hebrew language has no terms that can fully express the doctrine. The *place* of endless punishment has no *name* in that language. This is admitted by the advocates of the doctrine. Sheol is not the name of such a place. Ge-hinnom is not. There is no term that expresses the endless perpetuity of punishment. This has been proved too often to require attention here. And, it is confidently believed, that all who will investigate the subject with diligence and faithfulness will be convinced that the New Testament is alike deficient in these particulars.

We rejoice in the success of the Bible Society. We would be glad to believe that every reasonable effort is made to secure accurate versions. We are sorry to think that attempts

are ever made to engraft upon the sacred Word doctrines that do not properly belong to it. But in spite of all such attempts, there is no doubt that great good is accomplished. We shall carefully observe the proceedings of the Society, and give it the benefit of our criticisms.

ARTICLE III.

British India.

THE history of the progress of affairs in British India presents a striking illustration of the saying, "*Truth is stranger than fiction.*" If any great speaker in the British Parliament had risen a hundred years ago or more, when some matter of the small "company of British merchants trading to the East Indies" was mentioned in its proceedings (for it could hardly have attained to the dignity of a debate), and had declared that even the Nabobship of Bengal would yet be a British province, there cannot be a doubt that he would have been listened to with the utmost incredulity. But what would have been the ridicule of the wits of the honorable House of Commons, if he had proceeded to declare that Bengal would not form the boundary! that Great Britain would yet be the sovereign of an Indian territory, more than ten times the size of the British Isles, governing two hundred millions of subjects, and influencing as many more! The next matter of surprise might be that the British force in Hindostan would probably exceed that of the whole army of France in the time of her most splendid monarch, Louis XIV., — a force of three hundred thousand men, and one thousand pieces of artillery — completing the political and moral prophecy by predicting that less than three generations would witness the completion of all this. It would have required the largest measure of personal respect for the speaker to have secured him the patience of the House. His views would have been called

dreams, his calculations discarded as the conjectures of a disordered fancy, his anticipation ridiculed as an attempt to test the extent to which the public could be deluded by the passion for conquest, or the captivations of oratory.

The country in which this vast establishment has been founded, is among the most magnificent in the world. From north to south, from the snowy peaks of the great chain which rises between India and Tartary to the fertile provinces of the South, from the bold and rocky heights of the Malabar coast to the level shores of Coromandel, the land exhibits every variety of landscape — the deep and luxuriant valley, the mountain crowned with forest, a vast central table-land possessing an almost European climate, and exhibiting, between the tropics, the chief productions of Europe; a multitude of rivers, sufficient, even in that land of the sun, to fertilize the soil; a great peninsula, flanked on the east and west by two of the noblest rivers in the world, the Indus and the Ganges; and with its sides, from Bombay to Cape Comorin, and from the Cape to Calcutta, washed by the ocean.

The character of its people, at once festive and mysterious, exhibiting the most artless simplicity with the most subtle craft, combining the rudeness of peasant life with the most solemn and gorgeous superstition, corresponds to the powerful lights and shades of their climate. Its fields and forests possess the animals most remarkable for their strength, their sagacity, and their use, — the lion, the elephant, and the horse. Even its architecture shares the general spirit of a land where splendor is studied alike in the magnificent and minute — temples and monuments built by emperors, and worthy of imperial wealth, topped with domes covered with enamel and gold, and sparkling in an Eastern sun; while below, walls covered with elaborate sculpture, formed of every marble, and inlaid with every gem, exhibit a taste which, however opposed to the classic severity of Europe, yet shows that the elements of beauty exist everywhere; that talent is confined to no one climate, and that the sense of beauty acts as vividly in the bosom of the untutored Indian as in the refined cultivation of Europe.

The conquest of a country in extent equal to that of the United States east of the Mississippi, of such diversity and power, by a small island at the distance of half the circumference of the globe, excites feelings and inquiries very unlike those with which we are accustomed to regard the usual routine of worldly affairs. India, for a thousand years or more, had been the continual seat of governmental violence and popular suffering. Successions of local tyrants, crushed by some one greater tyrant, or absorbed into his empire only to emerge, on its breaking up, and return with their old thirst for blood to a still more ferocious renewal of their oppression, covered the land with misery. Even this lot was not the most desperate. The country from which the local tyrants drained its life, drop by drop, was periodically stricken to the dust by the sudden and irresistible blow of invasion. The Persian overrun it from the West, the Tartar rushed down with his flying horse from the North, and the whole strength and spirit of the land, helplessly buried under those barbarian multitudes, had scarcely revived, when a new influx of invasion buried it in the dust again. Even the occasional splendors of her dynasties cost her dearly; nothing could be more evanescent; and with the passing away of each throne came civil war and slaughter.

Even its position, in the centre of the most ferocious, war-loving and savage nations of Asia — the Persian continually looking from his barren and mountainous provinces upon the exuberance of the golden peninsula; the Scythian of the desert, driven alike by hunger and rapine to make incursions, from age to age, upon the timid and unprepared Hindoo in the midst of his treasures and his harvests — seemed to have laid it under a perpetual sentence of exposure and devastation. It has been, as it were, a vineyard, whose grapes bloomed only to catch the eye of the spoiler; with its fences broken down by the wild boar, the foot of the robber trampling upon its beauty, and the snake and the tiger usurping the place of the lord of its vintage.

There is no exaggeration in this course of calamity, not-

ithstanding the casual pomp of isolated regions of the great ninsula in other days, or the beneficial changes introduced ' some of those sovereigns who, from time to time, start up the most ruined countries. But what must have been the ıchanging character of Indian suffering, where the diadem as always lost or won by the sword; where the sovereign ways lived in the midst of domestic conspiracy, busied in its ınishment, or made restless and furious by fear of it and e people, under the haughtiest and heaviest despotism, laxed or violent only according to the indolence or passion ' the ruler; where the throne was but a lion's den, and the aughter and plunder of its population was wholly regulated ' the degree of hunger or satiety of the royal brute. Yet it in this country that the most powerful and comprehensive fort at restoration ever known in Asiatic annals has been ade, and that too by the intervention of Great Britain.

If this restoration had been accomplished by some neighring power, suddenly civilized, and dispensing its civiliza-on; if some Cyrus the younger had arisen in Persia, cultiting the arts and morals of the West, and shedding them te the seeds of a rich harvest into the desolate soil beyond e Indus; we might have attributed the result to the natural urse of things. But if the map of the world had been read out, and one had been asked to lay his finger upon the obable protector, the sovereign, and ultimately the regenator of India, Great Britain would probably have been the st country to whom he would have assigned this mighty ıdertaking. Who would have looked to a company of merıants for almost unlimited conquest? to an island then not ntaining six millions of inhabitants, and at a distance of n thousand miles, for the acquisition, the defence, and the lministration of an empire of two hundred millions of men? Is it that there is a moral law, like the physical, requiring at the balance shall be moved at the extremities? that the storation of the decayed forces of nations shall proceed like e electric streams which rush from the poles, and expand in illiancy and power over the equator? that there is a con-

stant providential provision for renewing the spirit of mankind, operating at distances of time and space, upon which no one can calculate, until it presents itself to the senses? a mighty gulf-stream of influences and impressions, powers of renewal and means of human improvement, constantly making their silent but irresistible path across the disturbed ocean of human affairs? Whether this principle be the true solution, or whether some still more hidden and benevolent instrumentality exists in the councils of Divine Providence, India and Great Britain undoubtedly present the most prominent instance of a united purpose, and a combined action for the attainment of the most exalted results in the history of modern affairs.

British India covers a surface of one million of square miles, and is bounded by the Himalaya Mountains on the north, the Eastern Archipelago on the south, China on the east, and Persia on the west, and contains two hundred millions of inhabitants. The Himalaya chain of mountains passes, for a distance of four hundred and fifty miles, under the Afghan name of Kindoo Koosh (meaning the abode of snow), then pursues a southeasterly direction, separates India from Thibet, then traverses the southern provinces of China, gradually sinking in elevation until it reaches the Chinese Sea. This stupendous range is the loftiest in the world, presenting, for at least one thousand miles, a series of elevations twenty-one thousand feet above the level of the sea, with various summits rising beyond that height about six thousand more. No trace has been discovered in them of volcanic action; and these sublime mountains of gneiss retain the identical shape which they received when the crust of the globe was formed. Their peaks are covered with everlasting snow. Himalaya (the great collective name) is one of the gods of the country, the father of the holy Ganga, and the step-father of Gioa the Destroyer.

The Indian Desert extends laterally from the Aravulli range of mountains to the valley of Sinde. On the north it meets the valley of the Suttedje, and on the south is lost in

the Runn, or great salt marsh Cutch. From Hyderabud, as far north as Oock, in looking eastward from the river, the visible horizon is a bulwark of sand, two hundred feet high, guarding the valley of the Indus like a fortress. It is well characterized by its native name, *Maroosthali*, or the region of Death. It consists, with the exception of a few oases, of hills of loose and heavy sand, which change their position at the caprice of the wind, and which, but for the intervention of the Aravulli Mountains, would long ago have submerged the whole of Central India. The Runn is an immense morass of salt and mud, containing an area of eight thousand square miles. The salt deposits are formed by the River Sooni; in some places the incrustations are so thick as to have the appearance of snow. Beyond the Indus the sandy desert is continued.

Another striking feature of India is her rivers. The Ganges, which forms its northeast boundary, and waters its most fertile regions, takes its rise near the central chain of the Himalaya Mountains, and, flowing fifteen hundred miles in its course, empties into the Bay of Bengal. It consists of two principal heads, the Bhagirathi and Alcananda. The former, though neither the largest nor longest, is considered by the Hindoos as the true Ganges. It issues about twelve miles above Gangoutri, from under a low arch called the "*Cow's mouth*," at the base of a mass of frozen snow, fourteen thousand feet above the level of the sea, with a mean breadth of twenty-seven feet, and a medium depth of twelve inches. It forms a junction with the Alcananda at Deoprang. It flows thence, a smooth, navigable stream, to the ocean, diffusing abundance on all sides by its waters, its products, and the facilities it affords for internal communication. Its chief tributaries are the Jumna, Ramganga, Goompty, Goygra, Sone, Gunduck, Cosi, Mahanunda, etc., etc. About two hundred miles from the sea, the delta of the Ganges begins to be formed. Of its two principal arms, which form the outermost of the whole series, the eastern is the larger, and preserves the original direction of the main stream, together with its

name; but the western arm, or Cossimbazar branch, called afterwards the Hoogly, is considered by the natives the true Bhagirathi, and is invested by them with the greatest degree of sanctity. The entire delta between the two principal arms is a vast alluvial flat, two hundred miles in breadth, intersected by numerous rivers, interlacing each other in all directions, and which enter the sea by nearly twenty different mouths. The region about the mouths of the Ganges, termed the *Sunderbund*, is a pestiferous tract, covered with jungle and swarming with tigers and other beasts of prey. The annual inundation of the Ganges occurs in the summer, when all the lower parts of Bengal contiguous to the Ganges and Brahmaputra are under water. The average quantity of water discharged by the Ganges, is one hundred and eighty thousand cubic feet per second. The total annual amount of earth brought down by the river is six thousand millions of cubic feet; the weight of which would exceed sixty times that of the great pyramid of Egypt. The Ganges, like the Brahmaputra, the Amazon, and several of the European rivers, is subject to the *bore*, or a rapid rush of the tide in a perpendicular face, up the river to a considerable distance. The column of water is sometimes a dozen feet in height, and its appearance is that of a monstrous billow in a storm, and its sound resembles that of a steamboat, but infinitely louder.

But with all the difficulties and dangers of the Ganges, the English owe almost as much gratitude to it as the Hindoos; for unquestionably they are indebted to it for their Indian empire. Its value to the natives is incalculable. Not only the main stream, but all its tributaries from the north are navigable for boats to the very foot of the mountains, for more than half the year. No river in the world has upon its banks so many populous cities, besides myriads of villages, temples, and bungalows. There are no bridges across the Ganges, after it has emerged from the mountains; and the natives who attempt to cross it where boats are not used, do so by means of empty water-jars. The Ganges, from Gangoutri to Sangor Island, is considered holy by Hindoos of all

castes. Hindoo witnesses, in British courts of justice, are sworn upon the water of the Ganges, as the Christians and Mussulmans are upon their sacred books. The water of the Ganges is believed by the Hindoos to purify from all sins; many ablutions and suicides take place in it; and the feet of the dying, if within an accessible distance, are immersed therein.

The Indus forms the northwestern boundary of Hindostan, has its source in the Callas branch of the Himalaya Mountains, and flows, after a course of nine hundred miles, into the Arabian Sea. It flows by Sadak, and receives the River Shyook, and the united streams run through Little Thibet, and after penetrating the Himalaya range, are joined by the Abooseen, and at Altock by the Cabul, where it is crossed by a bridge of boats, like that used by Alexander. The bridge is only allowed to remain between November and April, when the river is low. South of Altock, the Indus enters a plain, and in latitude 28 degress 55 minutes receives the five (Punjab) rivers, whence it pursues a southerly course to the sea. The rivers of the Punjab, the Suttedje, Bear, Ravee, Chenab, and the Julam, are generally navigable up to the place where they issue from the mountains. The amount of water discharged by the Indus, though not so great as that of the Ganges, is equal to that of the Mississippi.

Prior to Alexander's expedition into India (B. C. 327) the Greeks knew little of India, and nothing whatever of the country beyond the sandy desert of the Indus. The Hindoo records, if they had any, were destroyed during the intestine commotions which have always prevailed in India. It was about A. D. 1000 that Hindostan, formerly ruled by a pure Hindoo monarchy, fell under the sway of the Mahometan conquerors. On the fall of the latter empire, India became one scene of commotion and war. It was then that the Mahratta empire arose, like a meteor in the political sky, blazing away for a while, and soon fading into obscurity; and by its fall paving the way for the ascendancy of the British, whose powerful sway now extends from the Himalaya Mountains to Cape

Comorin. The Europeans, who as traders had long maintained establishments on the coasts, began to assume an entirely different character; to contend with each other in the field for dominion; and to mingle in all the wars and politics of the interior. Capt. Lancaster and Capt. Rimer sailed to the East Indies, July 26, 1591, in order to begin a trade there; Rimer was cast away, and Lancaster returned richly laden, but with only seven persons on board. On the 5th of August, 1600, the English East India Company was formed; they established factories in China, Japan, India, Amboyna, Java, and Sumatra. They were permitted, in 1698, to purchase the zemindarship of the three towns of Sootanutty, Calcutta, and Govindpore, with their districts, to which was afterwards added a district extending ten miles from Calcutta, on each side of the Hoogly, containing thirty-seven towns. On the Coromandel coast, the English possessed Madras, Vizagapatam, and Balusore, and Bombay on the west coast. The business of the Company was managed by the three independent presidencies of Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta. Pondicherry was the principal seat of the French power in India.

Lord Clive assumed the supreme power in India, and was succeeded in 1767 by Mr. Verelst. In 1774, Warren Hastings became Governor-General. He was soon accused of mal-practices, and in 1785 he resigned and returned home. He was placed on trial, at the bar of the House of Lords in 1786, and his trial lasted nine years, which resulted in his acquittal. Lord Cornwallis assumed the Governor-Generalship of India in 1786, and commenced war with Tippoo, which continued until 1792, when a treaty of peace was signed, by which he surrendered one-half of his territory. The administration of Lord Mornington commenced in 1798, in which he continued until 1805, when Lord Cornwallis assumed the Governor-Generalship; but owing to age and infirmities he soon died, and was succeeded by Sir George Barlow, who performed the duties until 1813, when the Marquis Hastings took the reins. The British rulers of India had long been

involved in mutual disputes, with the Burmese monarch, which were brought to an issue in 1822. The Afghan war, commenced in 1839, with a view of raising a barrier against the aggressive power of Russia, brought to the British no accession of territory, power or glory. In 1843 Sinde became a British possession. In 1845, by a treaty with the Sikhs, the British became the possessors of all the territory between the rivers Bear and Suttedje. On the 13th of August, 1857, when Sir Colin Campbell landed at Calcutta, a great empire seemed on the point of being lost, and the edifice, constructed with so much toil, and cemented with so much blood, seemed to be crumbling away. The dominion won by the genius of Clive, and Warren Hastings, extended and supported by the statesmanship of Wellesley, Hastings, Ellenborough, and Dalhousie, subdued by the sword of Lake, Wellington, and Gough, was now one vast scene of revolt, bloodshed and massacre. Our limits do not admit of giving the details of the campaigns of Campbell, Havelock, Peel, Outram, Windham, and Mansfield, which resulted in the complete triumph of the British arms.

If that country may be considered favored which contains within itself everything which is necessary for the maintenance of its inhabitants, India may be considered the most fortunate upon the globe. Immense in its extent, various in its climates, and endlessly diversified in its hills and vales, mountains and forests, streams and rivers, it answers all the demands of its inhabitants. Rice, in abundance, furnishes their daily food, cotton and silk their clothing, and the *bamboo* grows spontaneously everywhere, furnishing a valuable material for houses, bridges and boats. Salt is obtained from lakes, mines, encrusted earth, and the ocean. Sugar, coffee, wheat, potatoes and tea have long been acclimatized in India. The bread-fruit tree of the South Sea Islands, three of which will support a man during eight months of the year, they have in abundance; and the cocoa-palm, which produces cordage and thatch, food and oil, milk and toddy, with bowls to hold the nourishing or refreshing liquid, grows spontaneously on their

coasts. They share with the natives of the Eastern Archipelago in their cloves, nutmegs, pepper, ginger, and other condiments. Plants, trees, fruits, and flowers of almost all kinds, they either possess indigenously, or have made them their own; they have a climate and a soil for the productions of the east, the west, the north, and the south; and their vast country might seem intended for the garden of the world.

When cotton does not suffice for their wants, the juice of the mulberry tree is spun into silk by insects far more ingenious than themselves, and their sheep yield warmer wool than that which the Greeks reported them to have obtained from plants. Of the exquisite degree of perfection to which the Hindoos have carried the productions of the loom, it would be idle to speak. The manufacture of no modern nation can, in delicacy and fineness, vie with the textures of Hindostan. It is the only art which the original inhabitants of that country have carried to any degree of perfection. It is an art to which the circumstances of the Hindoo were, in a singular manner, adapted. It is a sedentary occupation, requiring patience, little bodily exertion; and, moreover, the slender and delicate frame of the Hindoo is accompanied with an acuteness of touch which is altogether unrivalled, and the flexibility of his fingers is remarkable. The hand of the Hindoo, therefore, constitutes an organ adapted to the finer operations of the loom, which is peculiar to him. They dye their manufactures with a plant which the moderns term indigo, and with lac munject, and other substances. *Opium*, or the white poppy, takes the place in Indian agriculture which the vine and olive occupy in that of Southern Europe. The crop is very precarious; the fields, covered with white flowers, may be destroyed in an hour by a hail-storm. Tobacco, though of inferior quality, where almost every person smokes, is produced in immense quantities.

The natural forests of India abound with a vast variety of woods, both useful and ornamental. The *teak* supplies materials for shipyards; mahogany is common; and maple, logwood, oak, fir, horse-chestnut, with almost all the European

fruit-trees, succeed as well as in their native countries; and cocoa-nut, sandal, cinnamon, and a host of others, yielding gums, dyes, and condiments, are either indigenous, or acquired. There is a national feeling among the Hindoos, allied to their religion, which studs the whole country with those shady groves, which are so welcome to the fainting heart. The present world of the Hindoos is linked with the worlds of the past and the future. His misfortunes in this life are conceived by him to be the consequences of sins committed in a former state of being; and the actions of the good to have relation to an existence beyond the grave. His ostensible purpose in marriage is to obtain a son to present the funeral cakes; but if children should fail, if no human being should be left for the rites of the dead, his *mango* and *tamarind* trees are still living things which pour the dew of heaven as a libation to his manes, and obtain for him, from grateful hearts, the blessing of those who are ready to perish. To plant a grove is to a Hindoo what founding a hospital, or building a church, is to a European; but with this difference, that in the case of the former the duty is more invariably performed, and never from worldly motives. When a European traveller, in journeying through the country, pitches his tent every morning on the green sward of some refreshing grove, eats at his pleasure of its fruit, and drinks of water drawn from its wells of solid masonry, he does not, perhaps, think of the beautiful and kindly feeling which, many years before, had prepared these things for his refreshment and repose. A native, however, invariably repays the founder with a brief prayer, or at least a kind and grateful thought; and this is all for which the founder had mentally stipulated with the unknown objects of his bounty.

Barbarous nations indulge a peculiar gratification in pretensions to a remote antiquity. The present age of the world, according to the system of the Hindoos, is divided into four great periods, called *yugs*. The first is the Satya yug, comprising 1,728,000 years; the second, the Treta yug, comprising 1,296,000 years; the third, the Dwapar yug, comprising

864,000 years; and the fourth, the Cali yug, which will extend to 432,000 years. Of these periods, the first three have expired, and at the present time 4,964 of the last. From the commencement, therefore, of Satya yug to the present time, is 3,892,964 years — the antiquity to which this nation lays claim. It is related that at the commencement of the Satya yug, or 3,892,964 years ago, lived Satyavrata, otherwise called (for these remote personages were frequently blessed with an *alias*) *Vaivaswata*, and also the seventh Menu. He had escaped, with his family, an universal deluge, which had destroyed the remainder of the human race. Of his descendants there were two royal branches: the one called the children of the sun; the other, the children of the moon. At the thousandth year of the present, or Cali yug, both these families became extinct. Satyavrata, the primitive sire, prolonged his existence as well as his reign during the entire period of the Satya yug, or 1,728,000 years. In addition to the two lines of solar and lunar kings, a different race, who reigned in Magradha or Bahar, commences with the fourth period.

After a lapse of time the throne was usurped by a race of Sudras, the lowest of the four castes of Hindoos, whose occupation is labor, and who are held in abhorrence and contempt by the others. The first of this dynasty slew his master and seized the government. The character which the Hindoos assign to the several yugs is remarkable. The Satya yug is distinguished by the epithet of golden; the Treta yug by that of silver; the Dwapar yug by that of copper; and the Cali yug is called earthen. In these several ages, the virtue, the life, and the stature of man exhibited a remarkable diversity. In the Satya yug, the whole race were virtuous and pure; the life of man was 100,000 years, and his stature thirty-two feet. In the Treta yug, one-third of mankind were corrupt, and human life was reduced to 10,000 years. One-half of the human race were depraved in the Dwapar yug, and 1,000 years bounded the period of human life. In the Cali yug, all men are corrupt, and human life is

restricted to 100 years. To these rules the reigning princes were an exception. Nowhere among men have the laws of society been more exclusively referred to divine authority, than by those who instituted the theocracy of the Hindoos. Their first legislator, whose name it is impossible to trace, appears to have represented himself as the republisher of the will of God. He informed his countrymen that, at the beginning of the world, the Creator revealed his duties to man in the four sacred books, called *Vedas;* that during the first age, of immense duration, mankind obeyed them and were happy; that during the second and third they only partially obeyed, and happiness was proportionately diminished; that since the commencement of the fourth age disobedience and misery have totally prevailed, until the Vedas were forgotten and lost; that now, however, he was commissioned to reveal them anew to his countrymen, and claim their obedience.

The division into *castes*, made by the author of the Hindoo laws, may fairly be considered the first and simplest form of the division of labor and employments. The priest is regarded by the rudest tribes as of the highest importance. Whenever men begin to possess property and to cultivate the soil, the necessity of defenders is powerfully felt; a class, therefore, of soldiers, as well as a class of husbandmen, is required. There are other services, auxiliary to these, for which it is necessary to provide. The Hindoos were thus divided into four *castes*. The first were the *Brahmins* or priests; the second, the *Cshatriyas* or soldiers; the third, the *Vaisyas* or husbandmen; and the fourth, the *Suydras* or servants and laborers. The Brahmins, among the Hindoos, have acquired an authority more exalted than among any other portion of mankind. As great a distance as there is between the Brahmin and the Divinity, so great a distance is there between the Brahmin and the rest of his species. According to the sacred books of the Hindoos, the Brahmin proceeded from the mouth of the Creator, which is the seat of wisdom; the Cshatriya proceeded from his arm; the Vaisya from his thigh; and the Sudra from his foot; therefore is the Brahmin infinitely supe-

rior to all other human beings. The sacred books are exclusively his; he alone is worthy to expound the word of God. "For contumelious language," says the law of Menu, "a Sudra must have an iron style ten fingers long thrust red-hot into his mouth; and for offering to give instruction to priests, hot oil must be poured into his mouth and ears." A Brahmin is so much superior to the king, that he would not eat with him, nor permit his daughter to marry his sovereign.

The Cshatriyas, or military class, is next in point of dignity to the priestly tribe. To all but the Brahmin, the Cshatriyas are an object of undoubted respect. They are as much elevated above the classes below them, as the Brahmins stand exalted above the rest of mankind. The Vaisyas are the third caste of the Hindoos, whose duties are to tend cattle, traffic in merchandise, and to cultivate the ground. They are superior only to the Sudras, who owe to them, however, the same awful respect which it is incumbent on the Vaisyas to pay to the Cshatriyas and Brahmins. As much as the Brahmin is an object of intense veneration, so much is the Sudra an object of contempt to the other classes of his countrymen. His business is servile labor, and his degradation is inhuman. He is deprived of all share in social institutions, subjected to greater punishment for crime, and even his person and labor are not free. A Brahmin may compel him to servile labor, because he was created by the Self-Existent for that purpose. A Brahmin must never read the Veda in the presence of Sudras; nor give advice to them; nor what remains from his table; nor clarified butter, of which part has been offered; nor give spiritual counsel to him; nor inform him of the legal expiation for his sin. When a Brahmin cannot obtain employment in his order, he may apply himself to that of the Cshatriya, or the Vaisya, but never degrade himself to that of the Sudra. The Cshatriya, and Vaisya, under like necessity, may resort to the class or classes below them, even that of the Sudra, but are strictly prohibited from profaning any order above them. The unfortunate Sudra, often straitened, may be driven forth by the interfer-

ence of the two orders above him, may be deprived of his employment and left without resources, by all the other classes of the community.

But, "*beneath the lowest depth, another depth.*" By the sacred books, the different castes were commanded to marry with those only of their own class; but irregularities took place; children were born who belonged to no caste, and for whom there was no occupation. This impure brood was called the *Burren Sunker*, and they were classified accordingly. They were artizans and handicraftsmen, thirty-six branches of which are mentioned in the sacred books. The highest is that sprung from the conjunction of a Brahmin with a woman of the Cshatriya class. The lowest of all is the offspring of a Sudra, with a woman of the sacred class, denominated *Chandalas*, who are regarded with great abhorrence. Their occupation is to carry out corpses, execute criminals, and perform other offices, to the last degree vile and degrading. They are condemned to live in a sequestered spot, that they may not pollute the town in which they reside.

There are very few, even among the most barbarous nations, who have not attempted to account for the origin of the universe. That contained in the sacred volumes of the Hindoos, which bears the name of Menu, may be taken as a standard, being more circumstantial than any furnished by the Vedas. "The self-existing power," says Menu, "having willed to produce various beings, first, with a thought created the waters. He placed in them a productive seed. The seed became an egg. In this egg the divine being deposited himself; and there he lay, in a state of inactivity, a whole year of the Creator; that is, according to the Hindoos, 1,555,200,000,000 solar years of mortals. At the end of this astonishing period, he caused, by his thought, the egg to divide itself, and was himself born in the form of *Brahma*, the great forefather of all spirits; thus, from THAT WHICH IS, the first cause was produced, the divine male, famed in all worlds, under the appellation of Brahma." This is celebrated, in Hindoo books, as the great transformation of the Divine Being from neuter to

masculine, for the purpose of creating worlds; and under this masculine form of Brahma it was that he produced the rest of creation. They believe that he was engaged in it no less than 17,064,000 years. Of the two divisions of the egg, from which he had just been freed, he framed the heaven above, the earth beneath, and, in the midst, the subtle ether, the eight regions, and the permanent receptacle of waters.

The creation of man, or at least of the Hindoos, is worthy of regard. "That the human race might be multiplied, he caused the Brahmin to proceed from his mouth, the Cshatriya from his arm, the Vaisya from his thigh, and the Sudra from his foot." And as if "The Mighty Power" could not produce them by his male power alone, "he divided his own substance, and became half male and half female. By this female, the male half produced Viraj, a demigod and saint; Viraj, by the virtue of austere devotion, produced Menu, another demigod and saint." Menu again, "desirous of giving birth to a race of men," produced ten lords of created beings; and these lords produced, at his command, "seven other Menus, deities, great sages, benevolent genii, fierce giants, nymphs, demons, serpents, birds, fishes, reptiles, comets, meteors and men."

Of the host of Hindoo divinities, Brahma, Vishnu and Siva are the most exalted. The Hindoos have distributed the creation and government of the universe among those three,—styling Brahma the creator, Vishnu the preserver, and Siva the destroyer. Of the peculiar functions of Vishnu and Siva, no determinate conception appears to have been formed. Vishnu is not infrequently employed in acts which properly belong to a destructive power; and Siva is sometimes a divinity scarcely less beneficent than Vishnu. The Hindoo religion is so pliant that there is scarcely an opinion which it will not countenance.

In all the nation men eat, drink, meet, converse, transact business, and sport together. Much of the entire business of life, among the Hindoos, consists in religious services. Marriage is the highest religious duty. The bride is first bathed,

and then her hand is placed in that of the bridegroom, both having been previously rubbed with an auspicious drug. Except for some grand plan of devotion, as that of becoming a Fakir, — a sect of religious mendicants, who make pilgrimages in an almost entire state of nudity, and swarm about the temples, — no man neglects to fulfil this sacred obligation. To die without a son is regarded as one of the greatest of calamities. Nothing can exceed the habitual contempt for their women. Beating them is a common discipline, and an almost unlimited power of divorce is reserved to the husband.

It is claimed for the Hindoos that they are cleanly people, because they wash before and after meals, and leave no hair upon their bodies. But it is not so. The women scruple no more than the men to relieve their necessities in the public streets. Filth of all sorts is thrown indiscriminately into the streets, which generates a compound of smells very offensive to Europeans. The Hindoo, who bathes in the Ganges, and whose heart equals in purity the whiteness of his vest, will allow this same white robe to drop nearly off with filth, before he thinks of changing it. Their general nastiness is disgusting; very few of the inhabitants, above the Ghauts, being free from the itch.

The houses of the poor, even in towns, are built of mud, sometimes of brick, and thatched. The furniture, which is almost nothing in the houses of the poor, is scanty even in those of the rich. In the use of glass windows they have never learnt to indulge. Their ploughs consist of a few pieces of wood with no contrivance for turning over the mould, and the share having neither width nor depth, is incapable of stirring the soil. A harrow is literally a branch of a tree. The *hackery* is a vehicle with two wheels, less than three feet in diameter, of solid pieces of wood, with a hole in the centre, without spokes, for the axletree. To lessen the friction, the simple expedient of "*greasing the wheels*" never suggests itself to the *ryot* of Hindostan.

In the East, the agricultural classes constitute nineteen-twentieths of the population. The tenure by which they

hold the land is different from that which prevails in Europe and the United States. And not less different is the part which the land plays in the revenue system. In Europe and in this country land is private property. The owner can do with it as he likes. He can sell it, or change his tenants at will. In India, it is not so. There the soil has no landlord. The freehold of the soil belongs to the people; the rent belongs to the government. But the people are not its owners; nor is the government its owner. It is held in common between the two. The occupant cannot withhold the rent; the government cannot change the occupant. No man there can be dispossessed of his ground so long as he pays the land tax. It belongs to him and his descendants in perpetuity, upon compliance with that requisition. A class of men, however, have been superimposed upon the *ryots* or small farmers, called *Zemindars*, who act as middle men between the people and the government, who obtain a portion of the land tax — in other words, a portion of the government's share of the product of the soil. Thirty or more villages are often under the control of a single official. Almost every man has a little piece of ground of his own, and at the same time follows any other calling which the requirements of caste may direct. The bricklayer who builds a house, the carpenter who mends a table or chair, the coolie who carries a bundle, is also an agriculturist. Division of labor is carried further in India than anywhere else. In the code of Menu the land system of India was firmly established at a time when Rome was hardly built, and Europe was a wilderness. The rate of taxation is fixed at each period of thirty years. The rate varies in different parts at from twenty-five cents to one dollar and twenty-five cents per acre.

For the perfect administration of justice, the king is directed by the sacred books to associate with himself Brahmins and counsellors capable of giving advice. Any Brahmin, or even a person of the two middle classes, may interpret the law to him, but a Sudra never. The Court, or seat of judgment, is called the *Darbar*. The plaintiff discovers

himself by crying aloud, *Justice! Justice!* until he secures attention. Parties are generally heard in person, but lawyers may appear in behalf of clients, except in case of certain high crimes. The judge examines the witnesses; inspects the writings, if any. The wealth, consequence, or interest of the party become now the only considerations. The plaintiff visits the judge in private, and gives the jar of oil; his adversary bestows the hog which breaks it. The friends, who can influence, intercede; and excepting when the case is so manifestly proved as to brand the failure of redress with glaring infamy, the value of the bribe determines the cause. The trials by ordeal which distinguished Europe during the dark ages, hold a high rank among the Hindoos.

ARTICLE IV.

Dr. Williamson's Rudiments.

Rudiments of Theological and Moral Science. By Rev. I. D. Williamson, D. D. Cincinnati: Williamson & Cantweil. 1870.

WE regret that we cannot give this outwardly attractive volume a cordial welcome. For its author we entertain the highest personal respect and a friendship that has now existed for more than forty years. But this book we cannot regard as a wholesome one. We deprecate its influence. And notwithstanding the many handsome compliments it has received at the hands of the press, we cannot free ourselves from the feeling that it is not precisely such a book as the denomination had a right to expect from Dr. Williamson, nor altogether worthy of his fine intellectual powers or the acknowledged goodness of his heart. In the first place, the title seems to us a misnomer. It is called the Rudiments of Theological and Moral Science, and yet it requires no very careful examination to perceive that it affords but an imperfect exhibition of the elements even of theology, while it practically denies

morality altogether. In such a creature as it represents man to be, morality is as impossible as it is in a steam engine or a spinning jenny. The grand object of the work, we might almost say its sole object, seems to be, not to present the rudiments of theological and moral science, but to set forth and maintain to the extent of his power, the author's pet doctrine of universal predestination and absolute necessity. Then, the style is neither popular nor scientific, but a singular mixture of both. It wants the calmness, carefulness and precision that should mark a philosophical work, and the directness, simplicity and plain common sense which ought to characterize preaching and all popular instruction. It is not easy, therefore, to determine for what class of readers it was chiefly designed. If it was intended for the common people, it has altogether too much of the phraseology and air of philosophy; if, on the other hand, it was written for scholars, its views are too narrow and one-sided, and its discussions of some of the profoundest problems of life very partial and unsatisfactory. At the same time, many of its pages are overloaded with what seems little better than declamation, fine writing and special pleading. Finally, our author's method is the worst, perhaps, that could be adopted in a work and upon a subject like this. His reasoning is almost wholly *a priori*, by which, with a singular disregard of Lord Bacon, he undertakes, from a consideration of the divine attributes, to determine not only what kind of creatures God can make, and with what powers he can endow them, but also what kind of government he must exercise over them. No doubt it is within the range of possibility to hit the truth and arrive at just conclusions by such a process, though it would task the skill of a mathematician to calculate the probabilities of doing so. It seems to us much easier, as well as more natural and safer, to inquire what kind of world and creatures God has actually made, and what form of government he has placed them under. We need first of all to know what are the existing *facts* in the case, and then explain their relations and final causes as best we may. Dr. Williamson inverts this order, and instead

of reasoning from the effect back to the cause, "from Nature up to Nature's God," he undertakes to determine the effect from his conceptions of the cause. The result is, that his boasted theology is the product of sheer speculation; and yet with it he overrides all the facts of the moral world. Nothing can stand before it. In the light of this theology there is, properly speaking, but one thinking being, one will, one actor, in the universe, and that is God. All beings beside him are only his instruments, mere tools in his hand, through which, or by means of which, he is ever most wisely and perfectly working out his sovereign purposes and doing his pleasure. He made them, gave them their powers, whatever they may be, placed them where they are, holds them in life, surrounds them by such circumstances and influences as he chooses, and then governs them, nay, actually "controls" them, so that they do not experience a feeling, exercise a thought, form a purpose, or do an act, except as he sovereignly orders, and as was made absolutely unavoidable from the beginning. In Dr. Williamson's theology a human soul and a planet belong to the same category, and are subject practically to the same law of unbending, mechanical necessity. If one moves through its orbit precisely as the Divine Mind directs, so does the other. Both, at every moment of their being, are precisely where he wishes them to be, and in exactly the condition in all respects, which his wisdom and goodness from the first ordained. From the creation of man down to the present hour there never has been, and from this hour forward through all eternity there never can be, in any human being, a single emotion, volition, or action, which may not, nay, must not, be ascribed to God as its sole author, and affirmed to be in perfect harmony with the divine will and a clear expression of it. All began in God, and by the law of unavoidable cause and consequence, all is going forward with the precision of clock-work, and must therefore end just as he from eternity proposed — though what that end is to be beyond a wonderful piece of mechanism, it is impossible to conjecture!

It is readily seen that we have here a volume that is sufficiently remarkable, and an examination of it with any tolerable care will show it to be remarkable at once for boldness and caution, for clearness and obscurity, for seeming strength and real weakness, and finally for the apparent soundness of its reasonings and the absurdity of its conclusions. It is a remark of Lord Bolingbroke that "there is a knight-errantry in philosophy as well as in arms"; and one is tempted to believe that Dr. Williamson here undertook to give the world a splendid example of it. In his wildest adventure Don Quixote never engaged in an enterprise more inconsistent with the settled convictions of mankind, or more at war with their consciousness and daily judgments and action. Even our author himself finds it impossible to maintain his airy height with any constancy, and, while proving to a demonstration that all men act at every moment of their existence precisely as God foreordained, he perpetually falls to censuring and condemning them for their pride, or folly, or wickedness, as if they were guilty of some misdemeanor and deserved his reproaches. A volume of consistent predestination and necessity would be a miracle in the world.

Some of the faults of the work which we have now suggested, should be ascribed, perhaps, to the manner of its composition; for instead of being a compact, systematic treatise, it is made up largely of articles which were written at various times and under different circumstances, and obviously with different purposes, and many of which had previously appeared in print; and although "revised, enlarged and arranged" for the present volume, it is apparent that they have not been subjected to that severe treatment necessary to mould them into a complete whole. The want of this transforming toil, largely due, perhaps, to the author's bodily infirmities, has left the result a kind of literary patchwork, while the subject clearly demanded a well-thought and carefully-executed production.

It is to be hoped that, as a denomination, we have essentially outgrown the kind of theological and moral science

whose Rudiments Dr. Williamson has here so elaborately developed. That it should, in some form, more or less obtrusive, have held a place in our earlier history, was a thing naturally to be expected. The great majority of the early Universalists in America had been educated in the high Calvinism then prevalent in the country, and had of course been taught from their very cradles that "God did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass." When they subsequently embraced Universalism, their change of faith at first consciously involved little more than the clear recognition of God's infinite benevolence, extended not to the little company of the elect alone as they had formerly been taught, but going out and embracing, in the arms of a redeeming love, the whole family of man. An issue so transcendently glorious compared with anything they had hitherto been permitted to deem possible, naturally for a time rendered them almost indifferent to the process by which it was to be brought about, and especially as it removed entirely the most salient objection they had ever felt to the great doctrine of predestination, namely, that God had first in his purposes consigned so many millions of souls to hell, and then devised the means necessary to make them seem to deserve it. Among many other important changes, which time and a wider and deeper range of thought, and a consequent growing knowledge, brought along with them, this famous doctrine of the "divine sovereignty," as it has been improperly called — in other words, the doctrine of foreordination and necessity, has gradually been losing ground, till now we think it finds few earnest and still fewer consistent advocates in the denomination, and those chiefly among our older preachers and laymen, who are rapidly drawing to the close of their career. In this declining class the venerable author of the work before us holds a distinguished rank. The philosophy he here teaches has been held by him from his youth up; indeed, it is not improbable that something like it was taught him at his mother's knee. It was his first love, and will probably be his latest. He himself, at least,

entertains this fond expectation, as he tells us in his preface that "in that belief he has lived and in that belief he expects to die." We are, perhaps, little qualified by nature, education, or thought, to feel the charm that renders that faith so dear to him. No doubt the doctrine of necessity might be at once very simple and very easy, if one could carefully ignore all the moral phenomena in the universe, and with Hartley, Priestley, Belsham, and other zealous Necessitarians of past generations, contemplate the human mind as a subtle piece of mechanism, acted on by appropriate forces and working out its products like any other machine. De Quincey, we remember, looking at Hartley's theory in this light, speaks of it as "wonderfully beautiful." Perhaps we ought to concede to it the fascination that belongs to all air-castles, and which pertains in a greater or less degree even to those sciences in which we have to deal with simple conceptions and leave dull realities quite out of the account. We are of opinion, indeed, that most thoughtful persons have been obliged, at one time or another, to take a turn with this mechanical philosophy, and for a season, perhaps, thought it nearly as clear and as conclusive as Euclid. It is a kind of intellectual disease, incident especially to the young, as chicken-pox, whooping-cough and measles are to children, and one ought to congratulate himself when he is fairly over it. The misfortune with Dr. Williamson seems to be that he had the disease early, and had it very bad, and never recovered from it. And having been suffering under its influence all his life-time, he has finally come to regard his condition as a natural one, and were he now to be suddenly relieved from the malady, would think himself dangerously ill, like the poor English lady who ordered her physician to be called because, as she said, "she could no longer enjoy her murders in the morning paper." On the moral side of the subject, we confess ourselves unable to find a satisfactory explanation of his case so easily. Dr. Williamson is no doubt a sincere Christian and a lover of good men and good morals; and yet it seems impossible that he should not see that his necessitarian theory leaves man as

incapable of moral action as a windmill or a jumping-jack, while it unavoidably throws its advocate, whether Jew or Christian, into fellowship with men, who have shown little regard to either morality or religion. As Bishop Butler remarks, "the opinion of necessity seems to be the very basis upon which infidelity grounds itself," and "by this notion atheistical men pretend to satisfy themselves in vice and justify to others their disregard of all religion."

Our author opens his work by pointing out the difference between Theology, the science that treats of God, and Anthropology, which professes to make us acquainted with the nature and powers of man. The neglect of this obvious distinction, and "the consequent mingling of theological and anthropopological science has," he thinks, "infused mist and confusion into many ponderous volumes professedly devoted to the sublime subject of theology." This grave error Dr. Williamson proposes carefully to avoid, and to keep his "eye single to the greatest of all sciences, that of God." The object of this far-reaching caution it is not difficult to perceive. Anthropology acknowledges the existence of certain facts, such as man's moral nature, and, as a consequence, his moral freedom, which unfortunately stand in the way of our author's favorite theory of Divine Sovereignty. By ignoring these facts, or excluding them entirely from the domain of theology, he hopes to shun those fatal rocks on which so many barks like his have hitherto gone to pieces, and clear his way for a prosperous voyage. That he regards theology and anthropology as somehow inconsistent with each other seems oovious, for he finds "it difficult to perceive what right anthropology has to come in and assume to mould and modify a whole system of theology," and suggests that "if we ever attempt to bring them together, the part of wisdom would seem to be to make our anthropology harmonize with our theology, rather than to conform the latter to the former." The reason assigned for this remarkable proposition, is that theology is something revealed, while anthropology is but a mere human science! How a revelation can annihilate the humblest fact of nature

our author does not inform us. If our anthropology is erroneous, Dr. Williamson has undoubtedly the right to correct it; but if man is a moral being, with all the powers which morality necessarily implies, we cannot understand how this fact can be ignored by the philosopher, nor why it should be bent to accommodate it to the exigencies of our author's theology. Human nature is God's workmanship as really as revelation can be, and it is utterly unphilosophical to talk, as Dr. Williamson does, of either excluding it from consideration, when studying theology, or of attempting to warp its facts to suit our wishes. Then, does it not deserve to be considered that revelation, important as it is, is given to man as a rational and moral being, is addressed exclusively to his intellectual and moral faculties, chiefly for a moral purpose, and therefore presupposes, and in a manner proclaims, the existence of these faculties as clearly as though it had been one of its objects expressly to reveal them? Besides, a writer on theology should not overlook the simple fact that we come to know God as an intelligent and moral being, only through the rational and moral nature he has given us. We are capable of apprehending something of his perfections simply because we are made in his image and have the germs of his attributes, so to speak, or what is strictly analogous to them, in our own souls. A being by nature without power, without reason, without goodness, without a moral faculty, would be as incapable of becoming acquainted with God, as a blind man is of conceiving colors, or a deaf man of comprehending the charms of music. It is not easy, therefore, to discuss theology, whether in its proofs or its relations, without recognizing more or less directly the existence and nature of man; and it requires no argument, we trust, to show that when rightly understood God's works and God's word cannot contradict each other. Nature is not at war with revelation, nor does revelation find it necessary to deny or displace any of the facts of nature. Fortunately, Dr. Williamson himself finally adopts this opinion, for he has not gone a hundred pages in his book before he appeals to this despised science of

anthropology for the most conclusive proof of his peculiar theory! We will only add here that we quite agree with him in the remark that "the freedom of the human will is not; strictly speaking, a theological question at all." It is not so, because in the order of thought as well as fact, it necessarily antedates theology. It is practically settled in the human mind long before questions of theology can be agitated. *I am*, however insignificant the being who utters or even thinks it, is still an utterance of the human consciousness that must of necessity precede the recognition of the grander truth that GOD IS. To make it a question of theology, therefore, is as absurd as it would be to throw into this science the question whether man is a rational being, or whether our various senses are reliable. We have no difficulty with this question of moral liberty till we undertake to be philosophers. Men no more doubt that they are free, and therefore responsible for their conduct, than they do that there is a material world about them. It is only when they begin to speculate, and attempt, as Dr. Williamson says, to "push thought to its last analysis," that they find themselves in a fog and begin to doubt and deny everything that belongs to common life and common sense.

Precisely what object Dr. Williamson proposed to attain in the first two or three chapters of his book, we do not clearly see. They seem to hold no necessary relation to the subsequent parts of his work, and do not essentially promote his main purpose. He introduces and briefly discusses a variety of topics, some of which are perhaps surrounded with difficulties, and others appear to be made difficult by his peculiar mode of treatment. Around the simplest subjects he manages in this volume to throw an air of profound philosophizing, and unfortunately often leaves his reader only mystified and confounded instead of being enlightened. That we are finite beings and God infinite; that our range of positive knowledge is necessarily limited in almost every department, and especially that of the higher thought and life, are but common truths of which no one, it seems to us, need be more

than reminded; and yet our author dwells upon them, as if, when we enter upon the study of theology, they were likely to be altogether overlooked or forgotten. Then we cannot avoid the conviction that there is a superfluity of philosophical terms, as offensive to good taste in a work like this as it is unnecessary and pretentious. No one, we hope, who has read these formidable chapters will ever again need to have it impressed upon his mind that we are "conditioned in time and limited in space," however that important fact may contribute to his welfare; that our knowledge is imperfect; and that in matters of religion, as well as most others, we are left largely to "walk by faith." It is to be regretted, however, that with all his philosophy, our author had not cultivated a greater regard for the humble virtue of self-consistency. Of his neglect, not to say absolute contempt, of this gift, the volume before us affords some remarkable instances. Let us present here a single example. In the very beginning of his book, he lays down the doctrine that all our theology, all our knowledge of God, is and must of necessity be given us through a revelation; that human powers are quite inadequate to the task of discovering the Creator, or lifting themselves up to the contemplation of the infinite. His words are, "If God would be known at all to men, he must reveal himself, and all our theology must come through the medium of a revelation from him." The reason assigned for this is, that "the inferior cannot lay hold on the superior; the finite cannot measure the infinite." This position he fortifies by saying that "what we can learn by the simple exercise of our intellectual powers we have no need to have revealed to us," and concludes by telling us that "the idea of a revelation presupposes that the thing revealed is beyond and without the domain of science." All this, it should be observed, was said at a moment when Dr. Williamson deemed it important to exalt theology and disparage anthropology, so as to draw the needed conclusion that "if we have a theology that comes to us by revelation from God, then it should be manifest to the meanest capacity that theology is not a mere human science."

Now we do not propose to enter into any discussion of the important questions here suggested, though we can hardly avoid expressing our surprise that our author should not have offered a single word in proof of the fact that a revelation has been given us, since everything properly connected with religion necessarily rests upon it. If we have no revelation, then we know nothing of God! But instead of offering us the evidence of this indispensable revelation, Dr. Williamson amuses himself and poses his reader with a variety of questions about the relations of the finite to the infinite, of God to the universe, etc., etc., which have much greater interest in the speculations of the metaphysician than they can have in the practical faith of the Christian. But passing this, we are not altogether convinced that a revelation would be wholly useless, even if the great facts it discloses were quite within the reach of the unaided human faculties. We cannot have observed the slow progress the world has made in the natural sciences, in political economy, the science of government, and other branches of human knowledge, without being persuaded that a revelation of God and his perfections, of his purposes and our duty and destiny, would be of the highest advantage to us, even though we might have attained it in the process of the ages by ordinary means. A revelation would have brought this important knowledge to us much earlier than we could otherwise have reached it; and then, as a revelation, it would naturally have a more commanding influence over men, and secure a more earnest regard, if indeed it were not accompanied with a degree of certainty and authority, which as a human science it could not claim. It should be observed, too, that in denying the possibility of our coming to any knowledge of God except through a revelation, Dr. Williamson differs widely from many eminent Christian thinkers, who with Lord Bacon are of opinion that "God never wrought miracles to convince Atheism, because his ordinary works convince it." And St. Paul seems to have entertained somewhat the same thought, since he censured the heathen for their ignorance on this subject, "Because," says he, "that which

may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them; for the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." This language of the Apostle is perhaps universally understood, both by ancient and modern commentators, as a declaration that the eternal power and Godhead is capable of being known without a revelation. As Calvin says, "Man is so made that he can be a spectator of the fabric of the world; his eyes were given him so that by beholding so beautiful an image and reflection he might be led up to the author himself." And what we wish especially remarked is, that Dr. Williamson himself finally comes, by a series of singular approaches, to the same conclusion. He at first laid down the doctrine, as we have seen, that "if God would be known at all to man, he must reveal himself, and all our theology must come through the medium of a revelation from him" — "meaning by that term a special communication of truth." It was not long, however, before a change came over his spirit, and he discovered that, "speaking absolutely, it is impossible for us to conceive of anything as positively beginning to be, or of something as coming from nothing. . . . So, then, by the limitations and laws of our being we are compelled to think, if we think at all, that something always existed." Then he shows that this ever-existing something "must comprehend all of absolute being there is or can be." It is "infinite, boundless, and all-comprehending." "To this," he says, "we are driven by the laws and limitations of thought. No man who thinks at all can by any possibility think otherwise. Thus far human thought can travel, and thus far we may proceed by the light of human science, but no farther. It cannot individualize this infinite fountain of being, which exists from eternity to eternity, nor invest it with the personal identity attributed to God in the theology of divine revelation." Or more clearly in another passage: "Hitherto an attempt has been made to show that theology is a matter of faith, and not of human

science. The finite cannot approach and grasp the infinite, and, therefore, if God would be known at all, he must reveal himself. The investigations of science lead us, in the last analysis of thought, to the necessary admission that there must have been from eternity a fountain of being, comprehending the sum of all possible existence. But it cannot lift the veil of darkness which shrouds that mysterious and eternal existence, nor conduct us one line beyond the mere fact that IT IS." May we be permitted to ask modestly why we can by the light of nature go no farther? If we are forced by the laws and limitations of thought to admit that something must have existed from eternity, and if, as our author says, this something must be infinite and the fountain of all existence, we cannot see why by the same "laws and limitations of thought" we shall not be driven a step or two farther? When we consider the ten thousand instances of design with which the world is filled, and when especially we recognize ourselves — a part of this creation — as intelligent beings, must we not conclude that the author of the world and of man is also intelligent? "He that formed the eye, shall he not see?" Not only must this eternal something be intelligent, but since its intelligence is used wisely, and, in the great majority of cases, for obviously benevolent ends, are we not obliged by the same course of reasoning to infer confidently that it must be as good as it is intelligent and great? And having been forced thus far in our reasoning, is it possible for us not to take another step and proclaim this power, so wise and good, a person? If all this does not constitute personality, pray what does? To think and speak of this benevolent, creative power as a blind force or an impersonal law, may suit the fancy of a certain class of philosophers, who "pushing thought to its last analysis," have lost their common sense and landed themselves in a maze of errors, but it is as foreign to a healthy human feeling or a sound philosophy as can well be conceived. As a practical thing, indeed, no nation or tribe ever believed in or dreamed of worshipping an impersonal God. Among an almost infinite number of errors

into which men have fallen in respect to the object or objects of their adoration, it may well be doubted if an instance of this kind can be adduced. Curiously enough, Dr. Williamson himself finally comes to these general conclusions. In a chapter on The Attributes of God, a little farther on, he goes over the very argument exhibited above, and proves as clearly as he has proved anything, that this eternal something, of which he had been before speaking, "is the living and true God, and that in him dwells the fulness of all power, wisdom and goodness; and that if there be any other principle or entity whose existence is absolute, limitless and unconditioned, it belongs to the nature of God, and may be reckoned among his attributes." And when he comes to speak of human consciousness, and bring its unfaltering testimony to the proof of his theory of Divine Sovereignty, it is refreshing to observe how utterly he has forgotten his old dislike to anthropology, and all the weakness and worthlessness of "mere human science," as well as his repeated and emphatic declaration that if God would be known at all to men, he must reveal himself, and that all our theology must come to us through revelation. Under these altered circumstances, the finite begins to approach and grasp the infinite, and science, that a little while ago could not conduct us one line beyond the mere fact that this mysterious and eternal existence IS, now quite astonishes us by its enlarged powers, its easy action, and infallible deliverances. Now we learn that "the idea of God is the spontaneous growth of every soil — the natural and irresistible sentiment of the human soul. That it is not the offspring of the investigations of the highest order of intellect merely, is evident from the fact that the most ignorant of our race are not the less certain of the existence of superior power than the most enlightened and refined. The poor Indian, who gropes in nature's darkness, amid the interminable labyrinths of the wilderness, 'sees God in clouds and hears him in the wind'; and the roar of the tempest when it sweeps through the forest speaks to his consciousness of the presence of the 'Great Spirit,' not less dis-

tinctly than the silent movements of the spheres impress the being and the name of God upon the capacious intellect of a star-gazing Newton or Galileo." So delighted is our author with this great thought that he repeats it with new illustrations. Here at last, through these teachings of consciousness, the rich and the poor meet together; the intuitions of the most ignorant are on this subject identical with the results of human thought when pushed to its last analysis. "Thus when the most simple of men looks out upon a storm, he is as distinctly conscious of the presence of a power there, above himself, as he is of his own existence. If the thought comes to him, as it must come, asking, What is that power?—by the natural and invincible laws and limitations of thought, he personifies that power, and deifies it. He calls it by what name he pleases. He invests it with a character corresponding with the measure of his intelligence. Nevertheless, to him it is God."

Here, then, within about a hundred pages, we have a total revolution in our author's ground. He began by declaring that we could gain no knowledge of God except through a revelation. From this position he advanced and taught that we are obliged, by the laws and limitations of thought, to admit the existence of something to be eternal, but it is utterly impossible for us to individualize it or ascribe to it personality. Then he discovered that this eternal, impersonal something is possessed of infinite power and wisdom and goodness. And finally, after floundering on in this manner, he announces that the knowledge of God is universal, that the most ignorant, as well as the wisest, are conscious of his existence, and by "the laws and limitations of thought" are forced to ascribe to him personality and recognize him as God! For a philosopher, this, it must be confessed, is but a sorry exhibition. Had our author no settled opinion on this important subject, that he was thus left to shuffle about from one extreme to another, and no memory to save him from proclaiming with equal dogmatism every phase of his shifting and contradictory thought? In a work less philosophical and

less pretentious than this, such a procedure would be sufficiently remarkable, but in a volume sent forth to challenge the admiration and command the assent of all thoughtful persons, it is quite unaccountable.

The great doctrine of Divine Sovereignty, to establish and commend which these Rudiments were especially written, is very simple and easily apprehended. In it the beginning, the middle, and the end, is God. *God is*, says Dr. Williamson, and according to his theory there is, properly speaking, nothing else. "He is the substance and reality of all things; the life of all life, the fountain of all wisdom, the source of all knowledge, the reality of all goodness, the sum and substance of all that is." And since he comprehends in himself all possible existence, all power, wisdom and goodness, it is impossible for us to conceive that the sum of either can be either increased or diminished. They may be diffused through an infinite variety of forms, says the Doctor, but these forms differ from God only in the fact that they are "conditioned," while he is unconditioned and absolute. If we ask, What, then, does Dr. Williamson mean by creation? — the most natural, if not necessary, answer would be simply, an emanation of the material universe, as well as the human soul and all other spiritual natures, from God. Yet we doubt whether this is the answer which he himself would choose to give. He evidently feels himself exposed to the suspicion of pantheism, but fancies that he avoids the gulf toward which his speculations seem to tend by insisting upon the difference between the absolute and the conditioned. "The material universe is what it is," he says, "only by virtue of its conditions and limitations. Take these away, and the material universe is gone." Yes; but gone where? "Increase human power, wisdom and goodness to any conceivable extent," he adds, "and you do not increase the sum of absolute power, wisdom and goodness; you do but multiply the forms, conditions and limitations, by and through which divine power, wisdom and goodness become human. . . . Take these limitations and conditions away and they are no longer human

but divine." We fear this language does not clearly convey any meaning; it is too deep for us, we do not understand it, nor are we by any means confident that our author understands it himself. Would it not be better to keep within the range of our faculties? A little philosophy, like a little learning, is a dangerous thing. That revelation, which Dr. Williamson so highly prizes, tells us that God made the heavens and the earth, and it may be doubted whether, after all our speculations, we shall know much more. That the material universe and the human soul are neither God, nor parts of God, may be assumed, we trust, without offence to either reason or revelation, and farther than this we do not care to go.

On the process of the work of creation, Dr. Williamson entertains some opinions fitted both to amuse and astonish his reader. "Life is the essence and motion is the formula of the universe," he says. . . . "To insure variety, movement must be in all possible directions. If we suppose all the movements of the material universe to be in direct parallel lines, we shall perceive that nothing could emerge but endless monotony. There could not be form, or shape, or beauty. Hence it is good that motion should be diverse, and in all possible directions, such as we designate by the terms circular, angular, direct, horizontal, vertical, perpendicular, etc. If when the Spirit of God moved on the great deep, which was formless and void, the movement had been only in direct and parallel lines, no form could have come of it, no earth nor stars, man or beast, could have emerged by any conceivable possibility. Nothing but one dead, monotonous, endless level of parallel lines is the imaginable result. God saw, therefore, that it was good, that movement should be diversified in endless variety, so that forms of all conceivable outlines must emerge and the universe be filled with beauty." We have no possible objection to this singular mode of fitting up a world like ours, though we cannot avoid the conviction that a God of infinite wisdom and power might have reached the end by a much simpler process. Archbishop Tillotson

asks how long we think it would take, throwing out a quantity of the letters of the alphabet at random, before they would range themselves so as to compose a poem like the *Iliad!* We should like to have Dr. Williamson tell us how long it would probably take his motion "in all possible directions," before it would make a Venus de Medicis, or even an Egyptian pyramid, to say nothing of a living organism like that of man, or even of a grasshopper. This wonderful theory of our author reminds us of the similar one of Epicurus, so finely exhibited by Lucretius in his poem *De Rerum Natura.* The old Greek philosopher differed, however, from Dr. Williamson, in not starting his motion in all directions, but only provided that a few particles of matter should deflect slightly from parallel lines so as to strike others and thus gradually set the whole world of atoms flying in every conceivable way, that all the variety of forms should emerge, as our author says. But Epicurus, it should be remembered, went into the business of world-making, like some of our modern philosophers, without a God, and therefore exposed himself to the ridicule of Cicero, for turning some of his atoms out of their natural course "without any cause," merely to accommodate his theory. Dr. Williamson is more fortunate, and if God saw fit to make the world and all it contains by driving matter about "in all possible directions," we do not know who has reason to complain, unless it is Mr. Darwin or Prof. Huxley, who are pleased to manage the matter in a different way.

But by far the most remarkable feature of these Rudiments is found in their author's views of man, and of God's government over him. Having begun his work with the resolution to keep his eye "single" to the greatest of all sciences, and with a very humble estimate of everything below it, he leaves his reader to gather his opinions of human nature and its powers from incidental remarks and the general drift of his system, rather than any express statements on the subject. We know, however, that God made man and gave him all the powers and faculties he possesses. But these powers and faculties, whatever they may be, are, on the theory of Dr.

Williamson, simply passive. They act only as they are acted upon. They originate nothing, and are of themselves the cause of no thought or motion. Man has in fact no more the government of himself, whether of mind or body, than has any piece of mechanism. In the words of our author, "We can neither think nor stop thinking of ourselves, so that every motion of our powers of thought is a communicated motion, whose ultimate cause must be found in the fountain of all life and movement; for indeed what have we that we have not received? and what are we except what the Creator has made us?" As we can neither think nor stop thinking, and since every motion of our powers of thought is a communicated motion, it follows of course that we are unable to change the tone or direction of our thoughts, or affect in the slightest degree their character or tendencies, more than a watch can reverse its motion, or a stream turn its course and run up-hill. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that Dr. Williamson should ask, "Wherein, then, does man differ from a machine? Answer: The machine is dead; man is alive. The forces that move a machine are external; those that move a man are internal. The machine has no knowledge; man is gifted with intelligence. A machine has no consciousness; man is endowed with a conscious being. A machine has no choice or will; man has a thousand preferences, plans, and purposes. In short, a machine is what man was before God breathed into him the breath of life; man is what he became when God made him a living soul." But does our author really mean what much of this language would seem to imply, that man thinks, prefers and plans of himself? Not at all. In the light of his theory, it obviously means only that man differs from what we call machines in quality, not in kind. In all that is essential they are alike. A watch and an ox-cart differ immensely in size, materials, structure, and workmanship, yet they agree in being machines, since they act only as they are acted upon, and have no single power to do otherwise than they are made to do. So man is a much subtler machine than a watch, more ingeniously made, and

acted upon by more delicate forces, but as De La Mettrie said, and our author plainly teaches, a machine still, and nothing more. He cannot think, of himself, more than any other machine, and when set to thinking by his Maker he cannot stop thinking, nor change the aim or color of a thought, any more than he could create a universe. And although he has "a thousand preferences, plans and purposes," they are his in no other sense than that he is made to have them. He neither originated them nor can he put them away. They are his only as are his stature and his complexion.

Dr. Williamson not only teaches that God has not created any being capable of the least self-action, but insists that it is impossible for him to do so. "If it be said that God has created the worlds and given them power in themselves, so that all their movements are self-originated and self-directed, the answer is, the thought is impossible. God cannot create God. If the powers of the universe are derived powers, as this view admits, then they are not inherent, nor is there a movement by virtue of these powers which is self-originated, but all is due to the power which gives, and not to the thing which has received." "To predicate freedom of any being is, in thought, to project that being out of God, and invest it with life, intelligence and power *in se*, and that is to make it God."

With such views of man, we easily see what kind of government he must be subjected to. It must necessarily be of the most direct and efficient character. It is practically that of simple force. Man does nothing only in appearance; in reality God does everything. As our author emphatically says, "God disposes and directs all things and all beings, and is himself the final and efficient cause of all the various phenomena in the universe." "God reigns in and over all the affairs of the universe. He disposes and determines the state and condition of all things and all beings at all times and in all places, and under all circumstances. . . . In the material universe there is not so much as one lawless particle of matter, nor a grain of dust that escapes his control for a moment, or moves one line from the spot determined by his

ever-active and eternal laws. . . . And so in the universe of mind and motive. God is there also, working ever the counsels of his will, directing every movement, disposing every event, controlling every storm, preserving harmony in all we call discord, educing good from all we call evil, and causing all things and all beings to subserve the interests and the ends for which they were made." That God reigns, in the manner described in these passages, is the great doctrine of this volume, and it is set forth in almost every form of expression at the author's command. He not only deems it of the highest importance, but represents a denial of it as necessarily leading to blank atheism. "If it be said that God does not reign in all things," says the Doctor, "because there are some things which have crept into the universe against his will, then we have a right to demand, How many? If there is one thing that comes unbidden of God, there may be two; if two, a thousand; if a thousand, all; and we have the reign of God at zero, and the universe is without a governor. . . . In all right reasoning on the subject, the last result will be universal government or no government at all; and if no government, no God. No other alternative comes within the scope of legitimate thought."

As Dr. Williamson has but one kind of creatures, things and not persons, so it will be observed that he has but one kind of government, one form of law, and that is exactly suited to the things to be governed. As we have before said, it is a government of simple force, or the most stringent necessity. Men and angels are subjected to the law of force just as the earth and the heavenly bodies are, and they can no more swerve from it than can dead matter. "All things," says he, "are regulated and determined by a supreme and inviolable law. And further, God's will is the source and origin of all law, and without this will there is no law. Therefore all things are regulated by his will, and he is the absolute Governor of the universe in all its parts and in every movement." "These laws are as truly inviolate in the tempest and tornado as in the gentle shower. . . . And so of the universe of mind and motive." If this language has any

meaning, it is plain that there can be nothing in the universe which was not originally provided for and made necessary; nothing which can be regarded as any violation of law or contrary in the least degree to the will of God.

We have thus briefly sketched the theory of Dr. Williamson's theological and moral science, and in a manner, we trust, to do it no injustice and at the same time to exhibit in a clear and intelligible light its essential features. It is, as it appears on its face, and as its author professes, a scheme of pure necessity. "If it were not," he says, "that the word necessity carries with it, to many minds, the idea of a blind fatality, and not the certainty arising from an intelligent lawgiver and ruler, we should say of the present that it is as it is by an invincible necessity, which no power can now prevent; and of the past that it is as it has been by that same necessity, which God himself cannot change or alter"; and he goes on to prove that, as to the future, it is determined and fixed "by a supreme law that cannot be altered, abrogated, or successfully resisted." Thus everything that has been, is now, or ever shall be, is indissolubly linked together by the unfaltering law of cause and effect, and God's irresistible will is the sole basis of that law, and gives it all its efficiency. A bolder or more offensive scheme of fatalism was never propounded. It is in its elements thorough, and remorseless, too, as all such schemes must be.

It is not easily seen what occasion there could be to write a volume of the size of this, to develop and prove, so far as proof is possible, such a short-hand theory. Indeed, a large part of this book is filled, oddly enough, with the discussion of matters wholly irrelevant to the author's main purpose. One would suppose, from a careful perusal of it, that Dr. Williamson was surrounded by persons who deny that God reigns over the universe he has created, or maintain that his government is not universal. Hence he amuses himself with a long and able discussion on the following propositions: "1. God has no government over the affairs of the universe. 2. He rules and reigns in part. 3. He governs and directs the whole." Now it seems hardly possible that so acute a

thinker as Dr. Williamson, should not see that this is little better, if indeed it is not something worse, than an *ignoratio elenchi*. The question in dispute between him and those who oppose his theory is not whether God reigns, or whether the divine government is universal, but *how* he reigns, what kind of government he is carrying on over his creation? And even here the matter of debate is narrowed down almost to a single point. No one denies or doubts that God reigns over the material universe by what we call natural or physical law. The earth and the other planets move in their orbits precisely as God has ordained, without turning a hair's-breadth from their prescribed course. There is not a lawless particle of matter in the universe. The vegetable world has its laws, too, and they are inflexible. Animal existence, likewise, has its laws, its appetites and instincts, by which it is governed. In all these departments of the universe, Dr. Williamson may have all the necessity he desires, and that without controversy. But when we enter the realm of the human, and while we concede that man, so far as he is material and animal, is subject to material and vital laws, we insist that he is also subject to another and a far higher code, namely, *moral* laws, and that, in the very nature of things, to be amenable to such laws he must be morally free. Why, then, could not Dr. Williamson confine himself to the simple question, and the only question, properly in dispute? By persistently confounding things quite distinct, by practically keeping out of sight, half the time, what he undertook to prove, and discussing questions as of profound importance which no one denies, he exposes himself to the suspicion of a little disingenuousness. It looks like an instance of logical strategy. A volume of one-tenth the size of his Rudiments would have been ample to contain all he had legitimately to say on the question whether man is in fact a moral being, under a moral government, or whether he is a curious thing, through which God is pleased to think and act. Freed from the verbiage and fog by which his remarkable treatment has surrounded it, and standing out separate and distinct, the question he undertook to discuss is neither very extensive nor very difficult.

asks how long we think it would take, throwing out a quantity of the letters of the alphabet at random, before they would range themselves so as to compose a poem like the *Iliad!* We should like to have Dr. Williamson tell us how long it would probably take his motion "in all possible directions," before it would make a Venus de Medicis, or even an Egyptian pyramid, to say nothing of a living organism like that of man, or even of a grasshopper. This wonderful theory of our author reminds us of the similar one of Epicurus, so finely exhibited by Lucretius in his poem *De Rerum Natura.* The old Greek philosopher differed, however, from Dr. Williamson, in not starting his motion in all directions, but only provided that a few particles of matter should deflect slightly from parallel lines so as to strike others and thus gradually set the whole world of atoms flying in every conceivable way, that all the variety of forms should emerge, as our author says. But Epicurus, it should be remembered, went into the business of world-making, like some of our modern philosophers, without a God, and therefore exposed himself to the ridicule of Cicero, for turning some of his atoms out of their natural course "without any cause," merely to accommodate his theory. Dr. Williamson is more fortunate, and if God saw fit to make the world and all it contains by driving matter about "in all possible directions," we do not know who has reason to complain, unless it is Mr. Darwin or Prof. Huxley, who are pleased to manage the matter in a different way.

But by far the most remarkable feature of these Rudiments is found in their author's views of man, and of God's government over him. Having begun his work with the resolution to keep his eye "single" to the greatest of all sciences, and with a very humble estimate of everything below it, he leaves his reader to gather his opinions of human nature and its powers from incidental remarks and the general drift of his system, rather than any express statements on the subject. We know, however, that God made man and gave him all the powers and faculties he possesses. But these powers and faculties, whatever they may be, are, on the theory of Dr.

Williamson, simply passive. They act only as they are acted upon. They originate nothing, and are of themselves the cause of no thought or motion. Man has in fact no more the government of himself, whether of mind or body, than has any piece of mechanism. In the words of our author, "We can neither think nor stop thinking of ourselves, so that every motion of our powers of thought is a communicated motion, whose ultimate cause must be found in the fountain of all life and movement; for indeed what have we that we have not received? and what are we except what the Creator has made us?" As we can neither think nor stop thinking, and since every motion of our powers of thought is a communicated motion, it follows of course that we are unable to change the tone or direction of our thoughts, or affect in the slightest degree their character or tendencies, more than a watch can reverse its motion, or a stream turn its course and run up-hill. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that Dr. Williamson should ask, "Wherein, then, does man differ from a machine? Answer: The machine is dead; man is alive. The forces that move a machine are external; those that move a man are internal. The machine has no knowledge; man is gifted with intelligence. A machine has no consciousness; man is endowed with a conscious being. A machine has no choice or will; man has a thousand preferences, plans, and purposes. In short, a machine is what man was before God breathed into him the breath of life; man is what he became when God made him a living soul." But does our author really mean what much of this language would seem to imply, that man thinks, prefers and plans of himself? Not at all. In the light of his theory, it obviously means only that man differs from what we call machines in quality, not in kind. In all that is essential they are alike. A watch and an ox-cart differ immensely in size, materials, structure, and workmanship, yet they agree in being machines, since they act only as they are acted upon, and have no single power to do otherwise than they are made to do. So man is a much subtler machine than a watch, more ingeniously made, and

acted upon by more delicate forces, but as De La Mettrie said, and our author plainly teaches, a machine still, and nothing more. He cannot think, of himself, more than any other machine, and when set to thinking by his Maker he cannot stop thinking, nor change the aim or color of a thought, any more than he could create a universe. And although he has "a thousand preferences, plans and purposes," they are his in no other sense than that he is made to have them. He neither originated them nor can he put them away. They are his only as are his stature and his complexion.

Dr. Williamson not only teaches that God has not created any being capable of the least self-action, but insists that it is impossible for him to do so. "If it be said that God has created the worlds and given them power in themselves, so that all their movements are self-originated and self-directed, the answer is, the thought is impossible. God cannot create God. If the powers of the universe are derived powers, as this view admits, then they are not inherent, nor is there a movement by virtue of these powers which is self-originated, but all is due to the power which gives, and not to the thing which has received." "To predicate freedom of any being is, in thought, to project that being out of God, and invest it with life, intelligence and power *in se*, and that is to make it God."

With such views of man, we easily see what kind of government he must be subjected to. It must necessarily be of the most direct and efficient character. It is practically that of simple force. Man does nothing only in appearance; in reality God does everything. As our author emphatically says, "God disposes and directs all things and all beings, and is himself the final and efficient cause of all the various phenomena in the universe." "God reigns in and over all the affairs of the universe. He disposes and determines the state and condition of all things and all beings at all times and in all places, and under all circumstances. . . . In the material universe there is not so much as one lawless particle of matter, nor a grain of dust that escapes his control for a moment, or moves one line from the spot determined by his

ever-active and eternal laws. . . . And so in the universe of mind and motive. God is there also, working ever the counsels of his will, directing every movement, disposing every event, controlling every storm, preserving harmony in all we call discord, educing good from all we call evil, and causing all things and all beings to subserve the interests and the ends for which they were made." That God reigns, in the manner described in these passages, is the great doctrine of this volume, and it is set forth in almost every form of expression at the author's command. He not only deems it of the highest importance, but represents a denial of it as necessarily leading to blank atheism. "If it be said that God does not reign in all things," says the Doctor, "because there are some things which have crept into the universe against his will, then we have a right to demand, How many? If there is one thing that comes unbidden of God, there may be two; if two, a thousand; if a thousand, all; and we have the reign of God at zero, and the universe is without a governor. . . . In all right reasoning on the subject, the last result will be universal government or no government at all; and if no government, no God. No other alternative comes within the scope of legitimate thought."

As Dr. Williamson has but one kind of creatures, things and not persons, so it will be observed that he has but one kind of government, one form of law, and that is exactly suited to the things to be governed. As we have before said, it is a government of simple force, or the most stringent necessity. Men and angels are subjected to the law of force just as the earth and the heavenly bodies are, and they can no more swerve from it than can dead matter. "All things," says he, "are regulated and determined by a supreme and inviolable law. And further, God's will is the source and origin of all law, and without this will there is no law. Therefore all things are regulated by his will, and he is the absolute Governor of the universe in all its parts and in every movement." "These laws are as truly inviolate in the tempest and tornado as in the gentle shower. . . . And so of the universe of mind and motive." If this language has any

meaning, it is plain that there can be nothing in the universe which was not originally provided for and made necessary; nothing which can be regarded as any violation of law or contrary in the least degree to the will of God.

We have thus briefly sketched the theory of Dr. Williamson's theological and moral science, and in a manner, we trust, to do it no injustice and at the same time to exhibit in a clear and intelligible light its essential features. It is, as it appears on its face, and as its author professes, a scheme of pure necessity. "If it were not," he says, "that the word necessity carries with it, to many minds, the idea of a blind fatality, and not the certainty arising from an intelligent lawgiver and ruler, we should say of the present that it is as it is by an invincible necessity, which no power can now prevent; and of the past that it is as it has been by that same necessity, which God himself cannot change or alter"; and he goes on to prove that, as to the future, it is determined and fixed "by a supreme law that cannot be altered, abrogated, or successfully resisted." Thus everything that has been, is now, or ever shall be, is indissolubly linked together by the unfaltering law of cause and effect, and God's irresistible will is the sole basis of that law, and gives it all its efficiency. A bolder or more offensive scheme of fatalism was never propounded. It is in its elements thorough, and remorseless, too, as all such schemes must be.

It is not easily seen what occasion there could be to write a volume of the size of this, to develop and prove, so far as proof is possible, such a short-hand theory. Indeed, a large part of this book is filled, oddly enough, with the discussion of matters wholly irrelevant to the author's main purpose. One would suppose, from a careful perusal of it, that Dr. Williamson was surrounded by persons who deny that God reigns over the universe he has created, or maintain that his government is not universal. Hence he amuses himself with a long and able discussion on the following propositions: "1. God has no government over the affairs of the universe. 2. He rules and reigns in part. 3. He governs and directs the whole." Now it seems hardly possible that so acute a

thinker as Dr. Williamson, should not see that this is little better, if indeed it is not something worse, than an *ignoratio elenchi*. The question in dispute between him and those who oppose his theory is not whether God reigns, or whether the divine government is universal, but *how* he reigns, what kind of government he is carrying on over his creation? And even here the matter of debate is narrowed down almost to a single point. No one denies or doubts that God reigns over the material universe by what we call natural or physical law. The earth and the other planets move in their orbits precisely as God has ordained, without turning a hair's-breadth from their prescribed course. There is not a lawless particle of matter in the universe. The vegetable world has its laws, too, and they are inflexible. Animal existence, likewise, has its laws, its appetites and instincts, by which it is governed. In all these departments of the universe, Dr. Williamson may have all the necessity he desires, and that without controversy. But when we enter the realm of the human, and while we concede that man, so far as he is material and animal, is subject to material and vital laws, we insist that he is also subject to another and a far higher code, namely, *moral* laws, and that, in the very nature of things, to be amenable to such laws he must be morally free. Why, then, could not Dr. Williamson confine himself to the simple question, and the only question, properly in dispute? By persistently confounding things quite distinct, by practically keeping out of sight, half the time, what he undertook to prove, and discussing questions as of profound importance which no one denies, he exposes himself to the suspicion of a little disingenuousness. It looks like an instance of logical strategy. A volume of one-tenth the size of his Rudiments would have been ample to contain all he had legitimately to say on the question whether man is in fact a moral being, under a moral government, or whether he is a curious thing, through which God is pleased to think and act. Freed from the verbiage and fog by which his remarkable treatment has surrounded it, and standing out separate and distinct, the question he undertook to discuss is neither very extensive nor very difficult.

ARTICLE V.

Origen as a Defender of Christianity.

THE works of the early Christian writers demand especial attention at the present day, partly from the strong attraction manifested towards the *primordia* of the faith, partly because we are engaged, as against the enemies of Christianity, in a struggle greatly resembling that of the first ages; and they who know how to use these remarkable monuments will have anticipated objections that were met far more than a millennium ago. Among these works, Origen's famous treatise against Celsus holds the first rank. It is a vast and miscellaneous storehouse of deep suggestions and curious observations. A single passage in it seems to have given the hint for a book that has played a great part in modern thought — Butler's Analogy. Origen was one whose services claim a favorable construction, and who can never be dispensed with by those who take up the task of defending Christian Revelation.

We propose little more in the present inquiry than to review this ancient treatise as one might a modern work, and to point out its most interesting traits, — a task which, considering the limited space at command, may require two or three articles for its completion. In this part of our subject we shall not go beyond the first three books.

It is against his will that Origen undertakes an apologetic work on behalf of Christianity, remembering the silence of Christ when in the presence of Pilate, which may teach us how we ought to act when put upon our defence by those who have no sincere wish to know the truth. Actions speak far more strongly than words, and a verbal defence tends to weaken that which is exhibited in deeds. Origen disdains the idea that any Christian could be found so weak as to be shaken by arguments like those of Celsus, and therefore addresses himself either to those outside of, or weak in, the faith. Whilst, therefore, for the sake of such persons, he

offers conscientious solutions of the several objections urged by Celsus, he depends more on the large and massive effect produced by Christianity in revolutionizing the moral state of the world, reminding us again of the answer given by Christ to the inquiring disciples of John.

There were, of course, two great classes in the ancient world whom the Christian apologist had to meet — the Jews and Pagans, and objections on behalf of both these classes were supplied by Celsus in his infidel work called *αληθὴς λόγος*, "True Reason," to which Origen replies in the treatise we are considering. For the present we shall confine ourselves to the latter or Pagan side of the question.

One of the most familiar charges against Christianity in its earliest period was that of its forming a secret association. The Roman legislation was peculiarly favorable to guilds and clubs of various kinds, but then it required that these should be known to the laws and recognized by them. The existence of any institution which did not derive from human laws the breath of life, was an object of suspicion and fear; and such Christianity appeared to be, with its *agapæ* or love-feasts. It must be admitted, Origen's defence against this charge is very bold. He compares the Christians living in the midst of the pagan world to civilized people in a land of savages (he mentions Scythians), whom all could understand as forming themselves into a secret association against the unjust laws that surrounded them. Or again, he compares them to a conspiracy against one of those destestable tyrants whom Greek public feeling regarded as extraneous to the pale of humanity. Christianity was a covenant entered into against the tyranny of sin and falsehood. Those who remember the sharp line which Greeks drew between themselves and barbarians, and, again, their instinctive detestation of tyrants, can perceive how well Origen adapted his arguments to his readers. The former feeling must have constituted, with the majority of educated minds, one of the greatest difficulties of Christianity. It is, perhaps, no exaggeration to compare it to a religion announced, for example, by men of color, to Amer-

icans or Europeans, claiming obedience from the superior race, accustomed haughtily to look upon them. It is true that Celsus admitted — and it was not a new notion — that the barbarians had an aptitude for inventing ideas, and the Greeks for criticising, establishing and recasting them; but this did not remove the repugnance felt by the latter to whatever came from a barbarian source, and which began by overthrowing the wall of separation so dear to the pride of their genius and refinement. Origen accepts and enlarges upon the admission which had been made by the sceptic he is answering. A man coming from the Greek schools to the doctrine of Christianity, might not only judge it to be true, but work it up in such a manner as to approve it to the Greek method of demonstration. We quote the following passage, in illustration of this, from the third book:

"We place confidence in the purposes of the writers of the Gospels, knowing as we do their honesty and good faith, shown in their writings, and having nothing false, juggling, feigned and tricky. For it occurs to us that souls which never learned what is taught by Greek sophistry, abounding in persuasiveness and sharpness, and by rhetoric which is busy in the courts of law, could never have thus forged things having a native power to produce faith, and a life corresponding to it. And this I think was why Jesus wished to make use of such teachers of his dogma, that there might be no room for a suspicion of persuasive sophisms, and that it might be clearly apparent, to those capable of understanding, that the absence of fraud in the design of the writers, who were full of simplicity, was worthy of a divine power, and far more effective than a sounding of words and composition of phrases, and a train of distinctions and Greek technicality." [1]

Not, of course, that Christian dogma was incapable of form which it received as time went on; but it had, from the first, what it has retained amidst all the development of the schools, — an energy as addressed to the people, which Greek philosophy never knew. It certainly needed this, humanly

[1] *Origen c, Celsum III., p.* 135, *ed. Gul Spencer Cantab.* 1658. (The writer of this article has, in the larger quotations, translated them for the benefit of the general reader.)

speaking, to overcome the profound prejudice which pagan antiquity had against the Jews, and which is shown by the almost complete silence of early writers about that nation, and by the contemptuous ignorance displayed by the later authors.

As to circumcision, Origen treats the objection very briefly, asserting the authority of Moses in ascribing it to Abraham, against that of the Egyptians to the contrary, and mentioning the curious fact that they themselves, in certain incantations, invoked the name of the God of Abraham and Isaac. This tendency to degrade the true by partly accepting it, and yet placing it on a level with the false, we see is no new phenomenon in the world; and we may compare those Egyptians who mingled the highest of names among their false gods, with the Emperor Alexander Severus, who had statues of Christ and of Orpheus in his chapel; or with the Saxon Redwald, who in the same temple had an altar for the Christian service, and a smaller one for his idols;[2] or with the Samaritans of old, who gave the example of this sort of syncretism.

Perhaps the victory of Christianity over the ancient Egyptian religion has not been sufficiently considered. It must have been a much greater achievement than the overthrow of Greek and Roman paganism, which Egypt had extensively fascinated by its gorgeous ritual and mysterious temples. Its influence over the imagination of the pagan world is shown even in a passage where Celsus draws a contemptuous parallel between it and Christianity. Origen observes:

"He would compare the nature of our faith with the proceedings of the Egyptians; among whom there meet one, at the entrance, splendid enclosures and groves, and vast and beautiful gateways, and marvellous temples, and imposing buildings around, and very superstitious and mystical ceremonies; but on entering inside, there is seen worshipped a cat, or a monkey, or a crocodile, or a goat, or a dog."[3]

In reply, Origen demands what analogy there can be between Christian churches and pagan temples, or between

[2] Bede. Eccl. Hist. II. 15.

[3] Origen Lib. III. p. 121.

that which they revealed within to the worshipper; the one, the prophecies, Almighty God, the condemnation of idols, Jesus Christ crucified; the others, a brute beast adored in the sanctuary..

But again, the Egyptian superstition was powerful, not only from the awe-inspiring magnificence externally, but also from its aptitude to lend itself to the ideas of its western conquerors. Of this, a remarkable example is the worship of Antinous, which was manufactured, so to speak, and got up by the Egyptian priests to gratify the Emperor Hadrian, of whom he was the degraded and miserable favorite. Celsus had attempted to liken the Christian worship to that rendered by various nations to deceased heroes, as by the Getæ to Zalmolxis, the Cilicians to Mopsus, the Arcarnanians to Amphilochus, the Thebans to Amphiaraus, and the Lebadeans to Trophonius. And to these he added the worship, which had lately become fashionable, of Antinous, in whose honor even a city of importance had been built, called after him Antinoopolis. The latter parallel, as Origen says, seems to have been urged by Celsus only φιλέχθρως from simple hostility, and to deserve no answer in itself. Those who knew who Antinous was, and who were not the willing slaves of a detestable superstition, would certainly not go along with Celsus in an argument showing only his malignity. Yet it is noteworthy, in this study of paganism, to observe the preternatural hold this strange worship seems to have obtained over the mind of the populace. We shall again quote Origen:

"If one examines the case of Antinous with a love of truth and impartially, one would find that the causes of this seeming to effect anything at Antinoopolis, and subsequently to his death, are frauds and mystical quackeries of the Egyptians; and the same thing is related with reference to other temples also, as having been brought about by Egyptians, and people clever in such things, setting up in certain places oracular or medicinal demons, who often even torment those who seem to have transgressed something in regard to ordinary meats, or in regard to touching a dead body, that they may seem to frighten the ignorant multitude. And such a

one is he who, at Antinoopolis, is held to be a God of Egypt, whose virtues some who lead reckless lives tell lies about; while others, deceived by the devil who is there established, or condemned by a guilty conscience, think that they are suffering divine a punishment sent by Antinous. And of such sort are the mysteries they perform, and the supposed oracles, very remote from which is the case of Jesus. For not sorcerers meeting together, and out of favor to the command of a sovereign, or the bidding of a governor, seemed to have made him a God; but he himself, the Author of all things, conformably to his marvellously persuasive might in speaking, recommended him as worthy of honor." [4]

The worship of Antinous was only a strong instance of the same tendency which was so long exhibited in the Roman world, of deifying the Emperors. We have but to open the pages of Tacitus to perceive how perfectly serious that superstition was; or those of Virgil to observe how, at so early a period in the history of the Empire, it had begun. For example, take the well-known passage:

> Et viridi in campo templum de marmore ponam
> Propter aquam, tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat
> Mincius et tenerâ præduxit arundine ripas
> In medio mihi Cæsar erit, templumque tenebit.[5]

The less familiar poem of the *Culex* is, perhaps justly, suspected by the critics. Yet these lines in it, whether addressed to Octavianus or not, are very curious, and like the age:

> Et tibi, sancte puer, memorabitur, et tibi crescet
> Gloria perpetuum lucens, mansura per ævum.[6]

The pagan teachers sought to oppose miracles of their own gods to those urged by the Christians. Thus, in particular, Celsus stated that crowds, both of Greeks and barbarians, had often seen the god Æsculapius, and not, he contended, as a mere vision, but as actually working cures and foretelling the future. Origen disputes the ability of Celsus to produce such crowds of witnesses as he boasted; but there could not be a doubt there were crowds, both of Greeks and barbarians, who believed in Jesus, and some who worked miracles in his name. He himself, he declares, had seen many instances of

[4] Origen, p. 132. [5] Georg. III. 13. [6] Culex v. 36.

persons healed of severe accidents, mania, and innumerable other evils, which neither gods nor physicians had been able to remedy. But allowing that Æsculapius might be a medicinal demon, the power of healing and of prophecy was a thing indifferent, which did not of itself prove the goodness of those who possessed it; and, in fact, the alleged objects of the miraculous powers of Æsculapius or of Apollo were said, in many cases, to be persons who were unworthy to live. The claims of the oracle of Apollo, again, might be disposed of by such specimens of it as its recommendation of the pugilist Cleomedes to divine honors, and that of the genius of the impure Archilochus as the servant of the Muses.

To another class of reported supernatural events by which Celsus sought to discredit the Christian miracles, belongs such a wild story as that of the apparitions of Aristeas, related by Herodotus. Origen replies to this by developing the important principle that the history of Christianity itself throws back a reflex light on the miracles which heralded it in. Were Herodotus and Pindar to be believed, and those who schooled themselves to die for the doctrines of Christ to have their testimony rejected? He invites his opponent to compare the story of Aristeas with all we are told of Christ, and then judge by the results which followed the latter in the reformation of morals and reverence to the Almighty, whether credence was not due to it, and not to the apparitions of Aristeas. What could Providence mean by such purposeless marvels as those told by Herodotus? What good came of them to mankind? But Christians could appeal in all that followed the advent of the Saviour to a great purpose that God had plainly in view.

This same principle, with due modifications, might perhaps be applied very safely in meeting numerous alleged wonders of the present day. It is hardly necessary to balance the probabilities of their character as supernatural or otherwise, when they can be readily estimated in their results and action upon the world.

When Celsus, referring to the prophecies about the marvels

that would be wrought by Antichrist, demands on what principle one set of miracles should be held as proofs of divine power, the other rejected as produced by sorcerers, Origen replies in a manner which shows he had well weighed this subtle objection, too obvious not to have occurred even to ordinary minds, and by that very fact, of little moment. The great test again is the issue, the τέλος, which decided the view to be taken of the miracles of Moses and those of his Egyptian rivals respectively. The resemblance we perceive in the physical world between species like the wolf and the dog, suggests a parallel in the spiritual order; and the great apologist lays it down as a maxim, that wherever there is something worse which pretends to be homogeneous with that which is better, of necessity that which is better manifests itself on the opposite side; so that if wonders are produced by sorcery, there must be corresponding effects from divine energy in life. One must either, he says, deny both, or admit the latter. And if one were to admit that marvels may be ascribed to sorcery, and to refuse to accept those that come from divine power, it would be like maintaining that there may be sophisms and persuasive arguments, missing the truth, but that sound reasoning and a logic foreign to sophistry is impossible. The turn which infidelity has taken in many minds at the present day, running wild after mesmerism in all its various phases, makes the reflection of Origen on this head particularly valuable; and they exhibit a candor and an honest effort to meet the difficulty of the opponent, that renders them very telling. Not certainly that Celsus seems to have been a fair opponent, since he was evidently careless of consistency, and made it his great object to throw objections together; but his work clearly stated, in places, what must have caused honest minds to desire further light. However, to proceed with the point before us, Origen advises that the claimants to supernatural power be examined by their life and moral character, and the incidents attending their works, whether conducing to man's hurt or to the reformation of morals.

The question of miracles, however, was hardly that which must have caused the greatest difficulty to the pagans. What they seemed to have felt most forcibly was the humiliation of surrendering their philosophy to the demands of the Gospel, and the sort of affinity which Christianity seemed to have with the uneducated, illiterate multitude from whence came most of its adherents.

There were, it seems, plenty of fanatical pretenders to the supernatural, begging priests of Cybele, or devotees of Mithras or Sabazius, with whose audacious claims he classed the authority assumed by Christianity over Philosophy. Practically, the answer of Origen comes to this, that Christianity affords quite as much room — to say no more — for the highest exercise of the reason as the proudest philosophy, in the investigation of the things we believe, in the interpretation of parable, or prophecy, or symbol, or the divine law. But it is impossible for such pursuits to be followed except by the few, both because of poverty and intellectual incapacity. What better method, then, could have been devised for the multitude than that proclaimed by Christ? This admitted of no answer, because ancient philosophy had, on the whole, sacrificed the masses, or left them to be controlled by punishment rather than persuasion. If there is a class that furnished an example of what a philosopher like Aristotle despised, it was the servile; and it would be a curious study to compare the continual reference to the δοῦλος in the New Testament with the spirit in which the same class is alluded to in the Ethics or Politics. Origen points as a result which had been effected by the Christian system, to the vices in which the multitude had previously wallowed, and asks whether it was better they should be reformed in morals by a reasonable belief in the punishments of sin and the rewards of good actions; or not accepting their simple faith, to wait till they could surrender themselves to the examination of reason, which evidently could only be the case with a small minority? If a right thinking person would not suppose that even a physician who healed numbers of the sick, lived in the scene of his labors

without some providential purpose, how much more he who healed the souls of many, made them better, taught them to refer every action to God, to avoid everything that displeased him, even to the smallest thought, word, or deed. If this reformation occurred in a hundred instances, the effect would surely be divine in those hundred; but how much more is the contrast presented by Christianity, and on what a scale! In the spirit of the proverbial epitaph,

Si quæris monumentum, circumspice,

Origen seems to incite the inquirer simply to lift up his eyes and look around him, Christianity itself being its own argument. This taunt of ignorance was one, no doubt, which touched a mind like Origen's to the quick. We find him again quoting and replying to the same objection more at large. Celsus had accused the Christians of using language like this:

"Let no educated man approach, no philosopher, no man of good sense (for these are held among you to be bad things), but whoever is untaught, whoever is a simpleton, whoever is childish, let him come with a good courage. For, as they themselves confess that those people are worthy of their God, they plainly wish to persuade, and are able to persuade, only fools and low and stupid persons, and slaves and women and children." [7]

And further on, affording us a most singular glance into the feelings of the proud society, which felt itself giving way under the hands of Peter the fisherman, and Paul the sail-maker, and their companions or successors. He says:

"We see persons who at their houses are wool-combers, and cobblers, and fullers, venturing not to utter a word in the presence of the older and wiser masters of families, but who, when they have got hold of boys in private, and of some silly women with them, go through some wonderful matters, telling them they must not attend to their fathers and teachers, but obey themselves. And they talk nonsense and are absurd, and neither know nor can do anything really noble, being occupied with empty trash; yet declaring that they themselves alone know how one ought to live, and that if the boys obey

[7] Celsus Lib. III. p. 137.

them they will be happy, and make their homes happy. And at the same time, if they see one of the masters and wiser persons, or the father himself, approaching, the more prudent of them make off; but the more saucy set the boys on, whispering that when the fathers or masters are present they neither can nor will explain good matters (for they shrink from their stupidity, corrupt and depraved as they are); but that if they want to learn they must leave father and master, and go with the women and their playfellows into the women's apartments, or to the shoemaker's shop, or to the warehouse, that they may attain perfection — and talking thus, they persuade them."[8]

One imagines one hears the gossips of the pagan clubs, and the words of Celsus might almost stand for the expression of some angry infidel father of the present day. Origen, in reply, challenges his opponent to say from what *virtuous* father, or from what master who taught what is good, Christians ever sought to withdraw their children; and appeals to the effect of Christian influence in withdrawing women from an immoral life, from domestic quarrelling, from a mania for the theatre, dancing, and superstition. There were plenty, both of fathers of families and of teachers in the pagan world, from whom it was indeed a charity to try to remove those who had the misfortune to be within their sphere.

Farther — the pretence of Christianity having a preference for ignorance was one which it was easy to meet by the praises of true wisdom which are found continually in the Scriptures; and the slander of Celsus was but a caricature of that consideration for the great bulk of mankind in which Christianity contrasted so favorably with pagan schools. The Old Testament affords numerous passages too familiar to be quoted in proof of this; and in the New, the difference made by Christ between his public discourses and the private, or as the Greeks would have called it, *esoteric* teaching addressed to his disciples, is in keeping with the same view. When Christianity preached to the whole world, it necessarily included the wise with the unwise. Such is Origen's reply, in substance, to this sneer of the Pagan philosopher.

[8] Celsus Lib. III. p. 145.

ARTICLE VI.

The Ministry of the Holy Spirit in the Work of Salvation.

WE shall enter into no argument to prove that the Holy Spirit is not a distinct personality, is not the third person in the trinity, but shall simply say that we do not so understand it. We regard it merely as the spirit, power or influence of God. And our endeavor will be to explain the ministry of this spirit or influence in the work of human redemption.

In the work of salvation two things are necessary. In order to be saved we need from on high two kinds of help.

1. We need instruction, intellectual enlightenment. Man is ignorant. In his primary state, in the state of nature, the state in which he comes into this world, and in which the great majority of mankind have lived and are now living, he does not know what is right nor understand the path of duty. Man has no such intuitions of God and duty as to impel him, with unfailing accuracy, to know the one or do the other. Morally man is blind. His moral and religious faculties by nature are destitute of the true light. In the state of nature he does not know God, nor comprehend his duty.

True, his religious faculties tell him to worship *something*, but they do not tell him *what* to worship. And his moral sense or conscience tells him to do *right*, but it does not tell him *what* is right. All, therefore, we can truthfully say of man in his natural state is, that he is disposed to worship something that *he calls* God, and to do that which *he calls* duty. We cannot say that he intuitively knows God or comprehends his duty. For, if we do, we deny the necessity of a Revelation, and must reject the plainest testimony of human history.

Nothing is clearer in the history of man than the fact that he has no intuitive knowledge of the one true God. Polytheism has been the rule, and monotheism the exception, in the religions of mankind. And man has never had a harder les-

son to learn, nor one that had to be enforced by more solemn sanctions and a more terrible discipline, than the fact that there is but one spiritual and all-controlling Deity.

Take the Hebrew records, and see how this truth had to be iterated and reiterated again and again, in the most solemn manner, and enforced with the most fearful retributions, before that people would accept and heartily embrace it. And the incidents are without number in the history of the world in which men have done that which *we* know to be wrong, which the *Law* of God condemns, conscientiously and with every indication that they believed themselves to be in the line of duty.

By nature, therefore, we do not know God nor what is right. Hence we need instruction, moral enlightenment. We need to be taught what is right, and to be instructed as to the character of him whom we are to worship. God must so reveal himself to us that we may know that he *is*, and that he is "a rewarder of those who diligently seek him," ere we can worship him aright. And he must make known to us the divine law of righteousness and true holiness, before we can obey that law. Such knowledge of God and duty is indispensable to our salvation from error and sin, and our exaltation to truth and holiness. But,

2. This of itself is not sufficient. Something more is necessary to secure our redemption and moral perfection. To simply know the truth, to merely have an intellectual perception, however clear, of God and duty, will not insure our spiritual salvation, for we may hold the truth in unrighteousness. We may know the law of God, and yet not obey it. We may know God, and yet not worship him; and we may know our duty, and yet not do it.

True, conscience never consents to the wrong, never sanctions what it knows to be sinful; but conscience often lacks power to enforce what it knows to be right. It is often overborne by selfishness, and its voice smothered by the rage and storm of passion. We often violate the law of conscience, do what we are warned by this faithful monitor not to do, when

under the influence of sensual desires or selfish motives. Conscience alone and unaided, therefore, though it be fully enlightened, is not sufficient to move us onward, constantly, in the way of truth and holiness.

Hence it is clear that truth alone is not sufficient. Purely intellectual culture cannot of itself save the soul. We need another kind of help than that of pure knowledge to ensure our perfect redemption. Our moral faculties need a quickening, an inflowing of spiritual energy by which they will be enabled to keep us *perpetually* in the line of duty, and impel us continually along the road of righteousness. We need not only to know the truth, but also to have that truth so bound to our consciences and so fastened upon our hearts, that it becomes morally impossible for us to break from its embrace or disobey its requirements.

This is the second great need of humanity in the work of its redemption. This infusion of moral power is the additional help we need, after we have received the truth, in order to perfect our salvation. And this help must come, like that of intellectual light, from the Father of spirits. God must not only teach us his character and our duty, but he must give such additional spiritual power as we need to enable us to serve him and do our duty, or our salvation is not secured.

And *here* comes in the ministry of the Spirit. Just here is the place of the Divine influence in the process of the soul's salvation. It is the office of the Holy Spirit to furnish this spiritual power, to so bind the truth to our consciences, to so impress it upon our hearts, to so weld it to our affections, that it shall become in us the all-animating and controlling power of our lives.

As we view it, it is not the ministry of the Spirit to enlighten the mind, to teach doctrines to the intellect, or to unfold the *science* of heaven to the soul. That is done by the Word. That is furnished by the Law of God. The Bible is the great storehouse of religious truth. From it we learn the doctrine of religion, the character of God, and the duty and destiny of man. By studying the Word, the intellect may be enlight-

ened as to all the great interests of time and eternity. And it is not so much the office of the Spirit to aid us in this study, as it is to fit our hearts for the reception of the truth which this study unfolds to our minds; as it is to bind that truth upon our hearts; as it is to so weave and mould it into our affections that it may become a vital energy in the soul, moving us forward towards the mark of righteousness and the crown of holiness.

This position, we think, is clearly established by the conduct of the disciples after the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, as contrasted with their conduct before. For though it is undoubtedly true that God gave to them a greater measure of his Spirit than he bestows on the generality of Christians — for they needed a greater measure to enable them to accomplish the work to which they were called — yet we apprehend that the ministry of the Spirit was much the same in their case as in that of others. And though it be shown that the disciples were enlightened as well as empowered by the Spirit, it does not follow that such is its ordinary ministry, for their peculiar condition and the special character of the work they were to do, may have called for a peculiar and special work of the Spirit.

Be this as it may, it is quite clear to our mind that the great office of the Spirit in this case was to bind the truth to their hearts and make it a living power in their souls. This is evident from the wide contrast that exists between their conduct before and after its descent. Before the day of Pentecost they were weak, timid and doubting. Jesus had been with them three years, teaching them concerning the things of the kingdom, but they had received no real conviction of his truth and no power to impel their constant obedience. The hard heart of Judas was untouched, and though the others had much natural affection for him, they had none of that divine love for him that enabled them to taste death in his name. How Thomas doubted, how Peter denied his Master, and how they were all scattered, like sheep without a shepherd, in the hour of his crucifixion! Such was their conduct before the day of Pentecost.

Now look at it on and after that day. See how, on the reception of the Spirit, all doubt and fear were banished from their minds! See how the denying Peter stood up in the midst of the people and proclaimed his attachment to the crucified and risen Lord! And see how faithfully and with what unction and power they ever after preached the Gospel! There was no more doubting. There was no more trembling before the great and mighty of earth, but fearlessly and uncompromisingly they proclaimed the word, though persecutions met them on every hand. And thus, with a courage that is born only of heart conviction, they went on and on through good and through evil report, enduring persecutions without a murmur, defying the powers of the world, until martyrdom ended their labors, sealed their devotion, and gave them the crown of immortal glory.

And in all this do we not see that the work of the Spirit upon their hearts was to convince them of the truth Christ had taught them? What did the Spirit do but put them in remembrance, according to his promise, of those divine things in which he had instructed them? What did it do but to bind that truth he had given them upon their hearts, so weld it to their affections as to render it impossible for any earthly power to break it asunder, until it became a mighty moral force in their souls, propelling them onward to its obedience with an irresistible force?

For surely they had no *new* revelation. No new doctrines or sentiments were taught them by the Spirit. The doctrines they preached were such only as they had received from the personal ministry of Jesus. The character of the heavenly kingdom, the way of spiritual life, Christ and him crucified, Jesus and the resurrection — doctrines in which the Master had instructed them, and facts of which they had been personally cognizant — constituted the burden of their teachings. Clearly, then, it was not for intellectual enlightenment that the Spirit was given, but for moral *empowerment*. The Spirit to them was not light, but heat; not truth, but love; not knowledge, but power. The light they had seen, truth had

been taught them, knowledge Jesus had given them; and the Spirit came to add heat to this light, to fuse this truth into love, to convert this knowledge into spiritual power.

Under the influence of the Spirit, what were before mere intellectual propositions, the cold doctrines and precepts of religion, became in their minds living realities, eternal verities, vitalized by the holy breathings of the Infinite, and made potent by the voiceless power of the Highest. And thus did the Spirit, in their case, give such additional power to their consciences as to enable them to conquer selfishness, subdue passion, resist temptation, and hold themselves perpetually in the path of duty, and constantly move forward in the way of moral life and spiritual progress. And as in their case, so in every case. It is the office of the Spirit in the work of salvation, not to enlighten the mind, but to quicken and energize the affections, to help conscience in its work of controlling and guiding the life, and to transform the truth into spiritual power.

3. We offer in conclusion a few thoughts on the way in which God bestows this Spirit. If such be the ministry of the Spirit in the work of human redemption, it becomes a matter of the highest interest to understand how this Spirit is given, and in what way its ministry can be secured. Does God give his Spirit constantly and uninterruptedly, or only on occasions and for special purposes? Does God withdraw his Spirit from the world, or only bestow it at long intervals in its history; or does that Spirit flow down constantly from the throne of the Infinite, and run through all the records of humanity?

But one answer can be given to this question. In spirit God is omnipresent, filling all space and flowing around every heart. God can no more withdraw his Spirit from the world than the mother can withdraw her love from her child. Mankind are God's children, and he can no more take his Spirit from them than the mother can take from her children the love that is born with them.

True, we sometimes see greater *manifestations* of the Spirit,

see it poured out in larger measure sometimes than at others; but this no more proves that it is withdrawn, save on these occasions, than the clouds which sometimes obscure the sun prove that it does not shine. When God has a great work for men to do, when he calls them to a holy mission, as he did the apostles, then he gives his spirit in larger measure, in such greater abundance as the nature of the duty demands. But in doing this he does not take his Spirit from the ordinary affairs of the world. Through the world the Spirit of God perpetually flows, like the river through the valley; but sometimes it floods the souls of men and bears all before it, and then we see its influence more clearly, and become more conscious of its presence and power, than in its ordinary flow.

The truth is that the Spirit of God is everywhere. There is not an object in the universe that may not become a minister of the Holy Spirit to us. Nature, the Bible, human history, the preached word, good men as well as angels, may bear to us the potent influence of the Divine Love. Everything has its spirit, and every spirit is holy that is pure and heavenly, that flows down from the Infinite fountain, whether it comes directly into our souls or is ministered to us through visible forms.

Nature is full of the Holy Spirit. There is something deeper and more divine in nature than physical facts and material forces. The geological or astronomical construction of the universe is not that which gives the universe such a spiritual power over the soul. It is not the scientific truth that holy men learn from nature, but it is the Holy Spirit which breathes through nature that gives it such an influence over their hearts.

What, for instance, is that which comes to us as we look at the sea and contemplate its vast expanse of waters. We see no new truth, we gather no fresh intellectual light. The ocean is there in all its majesty as we knew it was before we looked. But as we gaze on its heaving and rolling bosom and listen to the roar of its voice, an impression of the Infinite steals over the soul, and a spirit comes from the deep that

972058

bears to the heart a consciousness of the divinity that rolls in the waters at our feet.

Or what is that we feel as we go out some glorious autumnal evening, and see nature as she is putting on the sable garments of decay? The earth sleeps in silence at our feet, and the stars shine with unwonted radiance over our heads. The seared leaves hymn anthems of praise, or rustle to the ground in prayers of resignation. The wind softly fans the brow or moans through the trees, as though singing a requiem for the dying summer.

What is it we feel as we stand gazing on these solemn changes of nature, glorious even in her vestments of decay and death? Is it some new truth we discover? Is it some fresh revelation of physical law that is opened to our vision? Nay, the scenes around us we have been familiar with from childhood. It is the influence of no new discovery that steals over our souls, but it is the breathing of the Holy Spirit we feel. It is the Spirit of the Highest, coming to us through these forms and changes of nature that so stills our passions, and tunes into harmony the chords of the soul. It is the silent power of the Infinite that lifts the spirit heavenward and makes us feel the nearness of the Divine presence. And so it is the Holy Spirit that flows through nature that gives nature such an influence over the pious heart.

Why is it that the pure and noble of earth have ever been such lovers of nature? Why was it that Starr King so loved the magnificent scenery of the White Mountains and the grandeurs of the Yo-Semite valley? Was it because *here* he could get clearer perceptions of how God made the world? Was it because *here* he could get full confirmation of some geological theory? Was it because *here* he could see more distinctly how God had piled up the strata of the earth? Far from it. He did not love these grandly wild works of nature because of any mere geological fact he could here learn, or fossiliferous rocks he could discover. But he loved them for the spiritual impressions they made on his sensitive heart. He loved them because through them he heard the

still small voice of his Father in heaven. He loved them because through their awful grandeur and overpowering vastness the Holy Spirit came flooding his soul, and bearing his spirit up above the things of sense, lifting him beyond the material veil, and putting him into the sacred presence of the Infinite power and the Infinite love.

The Bible is also full of the Holy Spirit. It is not always the instruction we get from the sacred pages that makes their reading so valuable to us. We may understand perfectly the teachings of a chapter, and yet its careful reading may make a most desirable impression upon our hearts. As we read again and again the predictions of the prophets and the story of the cross, though we get no new truth or fresh facts, were that possible, we experience an influence that stamps their teachings more distinctly upon our hearts, and gives them a fresh potency for our spiritual growth and salvation.

And so too with the ministry of the Word. Not always do we get from the pulpit intellectual light, and yet we may receive spiritual power. The minister of Jesus may not always be able to teach us new truth, and yet his words may come to us so vitalized by the baptism of the Holy Spirit as to quicken our souls with new power, and make the truth we already know more real, more potent for the regulation of our lives and the instruction of our characters. So with all the institutions of religion. If they do not enlighten our minds, they may inspire our hearts.

The Spirit of God is never out of the world. It is everywhere and always present with humanity. It is constantly at work through visible forms and all holy ministries. It is knocking at our hearts continually, and we have but to open the door and it will come in and make its dwelling-place with us.

GENERAL REVIEW.

The First Persecution of the Christians.

THE first regular persecution, not instigated by the Jews, to which the Christians were exposed by the Roman government, was that set on foot by Nero, the fifth emperor of Rome.

Paul and Peter were then alive, and Christianity had made such progress that even as far west as Italy and Rome multitudes had openly professed faith in it; and still farther west, even to Spain, it had probably been preached, and had made converts. Paul himself speaks of his intention of going there, in Rom. xv.

Luke, in the last chapter of the Book of Acts, says that Paul on his arrival at Rome was delivered to the captain of the guards, who gave him permission to "dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him." And he adds that "he dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him."

This shows that Paul was treated with great consideration, and allowed privileges not usually accorded to prisoners. The abrupt close of the Book of Acts leaves the apostle at Rome in the year of our Lord 62, still a prisoner — but zealously preaching the Gospel, and writing to the churches. The Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, to Philemon, and the second to Timothy were written at Rome. The church at Philippi had sent him contributions by the hand of Epaphroditus, and he sent them this letter by him on his return, as appears from the last chapter of the Epistle.

This Epistle also informs us that he had made some converts even in the palace and among the household of Nero. In chapter i. he says: "I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which have happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the Gospel; so that my bonds in Christ (his imprisonment) are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places; and many of the brethren waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear." Again he says at the close, "All the saints salute you, chiefly (or specially) they that are of Cæsar's household."

This shows that Paul had converted certain persons in the very palace of Nero, some of his own family, or those employed in the administration of his affairs. This fact, stated in such an incidental manner in this letter sent to the Philippian church, will, we think, explain in part the origin of the first persecution against the Christians, and the martyrdom of Paul and Peter; for it was in this persecution that these apostles lost their lives.

First, we must remember that Christianity was a foreign superstition to the Romans, not recognized by the state, nor as yet indeed proscribed by it; but, as long as it did not by its numbers or boldness endanger the state religions, allowed to go its way. *Second*, it was the religion of the common people, looked upon as the superstition of the lower classes, and despised by the philosophers and literati, by the higher and fashionable classes. Of course, therefore, it was an offence against good taste, and a violation of all the dignities and proprieties of the imperial palace, for any of its inmates to abandon the venerable religion of the state for this foreign and upstart superstition coming from among the Jews so hated of all men; the religion of one who was crucified as a malefactor by one of their provincial governors. And Nero would be especially irritated if the converts were from among his own relatives, as the language of Paul seems strongly to imply. He would regard it much as we would the conversion of one of our family to Mormonism.[1]

But at this point let us consider what sort of a man the Christians have to deal with in this absolute despot. He came to the throne at the age of seventeen, through the machinations of his mother Agrippina. He began well under the direction of Burrus, and the celebrated philosopher Seneca, who chiefly directed the affairs of state. This filled his mother with rage, for she aimed to rule herself in the name of her son — and a worse woman is not often found. The result of the quarrel was that she resolved to displace him, and set up his brother Brittanicus as emperor, Then began that series of crimes which startled the Roman world, and which has made the name of Nero the synonym of monster, fiend and devil.

He murdered his brother, and so disposed of his rival, and then he plunged into all manner of dissipation and profligacy. Soon after he murdered his mother, and then divorced his wife Octavia and married the abandoned Poppæa. Then he murdered Octavia on a charge of

[1] Mormonism and Chinese Idolatry in our own country furnish illustrations of thi condition of things in Rome at the period named.

treason. At a later period he put to death Seneca, his early friend and counsellor, and Gallio his brother, mentioned by Luke in Acts xviii; and soon after killed his wife Poppæa, or she died from injuries received from this brute in a fit of anger!

This is the creature who was on the throne of the Roman Empire when Paul was sent to Rome a prisoner — this was the Cæsar to whom he appealed, in whose palace he had made converts, and to whom he alludes in his letter to the church at Philippi, when he says, "All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household." It is easy to imagine that such a wretch as this, absolute in power, might persecute the Christians *for* a cause or *without* a cause, as his caprice might dictate. Let us, then, briefly note the event which furnished the occasion.

About the middle of July in the year 64, the tenth of Nero's reign, a fire broke out at Rome, which, getting the mastery, continued to spread from street to street, devouring everything in its way till, after raging six days and seven nights, the flames had swallowed up from one-half to two-thirds of the entire city. Out of fourteen wards, three were wholly destroyed, and seven were to a considerable extent laid in ruins, leaving only four unharmed by the terrible conflagration.

Immediately the report was spread abroad that Nero had set fire to the city, and that he had ascended a tower to enjoy the sight, and danced to his own music while Rome was burning. This may have been true or not, but the reckless and brutal character of the tyrant, and the hatred of the people towards him, gave currency to the rumor, and the public indignation was fast rising into the temper of an insurrection. Nero saw the danger, and felt the necessity for immediate action in self-defence. Something must be done at once to turn the dangerous suspicion from himself. It was no time for arguments or orations.

He decided on the moment what to do. The Christians had already begun to attract attention and censure by their desertion of the temples and public games, and their separation from all the accompaniments of pagan worship, the theatre, the circus, and the contests of the arena. Their numbers were increasing, and the emperor had probably been provoked by converts made in his own palace. Immediately he set his emissaries at work, and industriously spread the rumor far and wide that the Christians had set fire to the

city; that the followers of this new and pestilent superstition were the incendiaries who had caused this frightful calamity.

When the report had become sufficiently common, and began to be believed by some, Nero pretended to be horror-struck by the wickedness of these men, and promptly took measures to punish their imaginary crime, and hoped thus to turn the tide of popular suspicion and hatred from himself.

But the reader will be better pleased to hear the statement of one who, though a child at the time, wrote from the lips and memories of those who saw it all, and had part in the awful scenes of terror and suffering. We refer to Tacitus, the celebrated Roman historian, whose testimony is equally interesting and instructive. In social position, in literature, in the style of his composition, and as an authority, he was the Macaulay of Rome. After a description of the great conflagration, and the state of public feeling consequent upon it, and the vain efforts of Nero to soothe and mollify the populace, he proceeds as follows:

"But no human aid, no munificence of the emperor, nor expiations of the gods, could remove from him the infamy of having ordered the conflagration. Therefore, to stop the clamor, Nero falsely accused and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a people hated for their crimes, who were called Christians. The founder of the sect was one Christ, who was put to death in the reign of Tiberius by the procurator Pontius Pilate. For a while the dire superstition was checked, but it burst forth again, and spread itself not only over Judea, but even into Rome, where everything vile and atrocious finds an asylum and a centre. Those who were first seized, confessed; and by their confessions a great multitude were discovered, and they were all convicted, not so much for the crime of setting fire to the city, as for their hatred of the human race. They died in torments, and their torments were embittered by insult and derision. Some were nailed on crosses; others were sewed up in the skins of wild beasts and torn to pieces by dogs; others again were smeared over with pitch and used as torches to illuminate the darkness of the night. Nero devoted his gardens to the show, which was accompanied with public games, and was himself present, mingling with the crowd in the dress of a charioteer. But, notwithstanding the guilt of the Christians deserved severest punishment, public sympathy and compassion were excited in their behalf, because they were destroyed not for the public welfare, but to gratify the cruelty of one man."

Such is the account of the cause and character of the first great persecution of the Christians by the authorities of Rome. And now before closing let us note several things worth remembering.

1. This persecution took place only thirty years after the crucifixion of the Saviour; and a great multitude of Christians were at this early period in Rome. And this is the testimony of a heathen, we must remember. It shows the rapid spread of the Gospel in that age.

2. It is easy to understand how Paul should be among the first victims, because of the prominent position as a leader which his two years' preaching would give him; and also because of the converts made in Nero's household. Being a Roman citizen, it was not lawful to crucify him, and so he was beheaded. Peter, being a Jew, was crucified. So say all early traditions and history.

3. Observe what Tacitus says of the Christians hating the human race. In this he takes up the popular rumor without investigating its truth. But we have already hinted the reason of this opinion. The Christians, as soon as converted, refused to worship the gods of Rome, and separated themselves from idolatry in all its forms, whether in the temples, or national games and celebrations. They stood aloof from the rest of the family and from the people, in these respects, and found their affinities and sought their social enjoyments among their fellow-disciples. All this looked to their pagan neighbors and acquaintances like sullenness, and superstition, and hatred of the world and their fellow-men; and they so interpreted their conduct, and were ready to suspect them of plotting to the injury of all who were not with them in faith.

Forty years afterward, Pliny, the personal friend of Tacitus, and who furnished him for his history the account of the eruption of Vesuvius and the destruction of Herculaneum and Pompeii, looked into these charges against the Christians more carefully, and could find no crimes, no hatred of the human race, but only an obstinate belief of their doctrines, a few simple rites of worship, and a blameless life.

4. Tacitus mentions the gardens of Nero as the place for exhibiting the horrible punishments inflicted on the Christians. It is a curious fact that the very ground, on the Vatican Hill, occupied by these gardens, and which drank up the blood of the first Christians, is now covered by the most magnificent structure of ancient or modern Rome, the Church of St. Peter, the great temple of the Christian world!

Such are the revolutions of time. On the same spot where eighteen hundred years ago the Roman populace crowded to witness the sufferings of the despised and persecuted disciples of the crucified

Jesus, thousands on thousands crowd to-day to do him reverence, and to thank God for his life and death and Resurrection!

The old paganism which through those days and nights of terror held its high festival of blood there on the Vatican Hill, has died out from the city and the earth; while the new religion has held its way in triumph through the centuries, and now claims as its own an empire far surpassing in extent and grandeur that of ancient Rome!

Witnesses to the Truth.

THE *Advance* seems to be greatly troubled by the manifest spread of Universalism in our country, and especially that it shows itself so openly in the popular literature of the day. Even Orthodox writers of fiction treat the question of endless punishment so doubtfully and irreverently, that it is difficult to say whether they believe it or reject it. It declares that,

"The most widely-circulated papers, and the most popular magazines, are identified with the opposition to this scriptural (?) doctrine. Some of our orthodox novelists have so treated it as to be claimed by the liberals. The atmosphere is full of false notions and loose maxims, and their influence is well-nigh universal.

The question is, How shall we deal with it? We reply: 1. Recognize it in the selection and treatment of themes for the pulpit, tending to counteract it. 2. Avoid exaggerations in the statement of the doctrine of eternal punishment. 3. Beware of using feeble arguments in supporting it. 4. Let a liberal use be made of the natural analogies in the constitution and course of nature. 5. Above all, associate it with the character of Jesus. It stands or falls with him."

Mr. Spurgeon also finds the same degenerate orthodoxy on his side of the Atlantic, and bemoans the drift of religious thought both in the Established Church, and among his own Dissenting brethren, in the following lugubrious strain, from a sermon preparatory to a day of special prayer for the Baptists of London:

"Just now I do not know how you feel, but I sometimes feel very great alarm. The Church of England seems to be eaten through and through with sacramentarianism, but Nonconformity appears to be almost as badly riddled with philosophical infidelity. Those of whom we thought better things are turning aside one by one from the fundamentals of the faith. At first it was the doctrine of the eternity of future punishment that had to be given up; now it must be the very doctrine of the Fall — first one thing, then another, the

whole must go. They treat our doctrines as though they were all to be knocked down at their good pleasure when they choose to amend our theology. Through and through I believe the very heart of England is honeycombed with a damnable infidelity which dares still to go into the pulpit and call itself Christian. I do pray God may preserve our denomination from it."

This lament brings out a correspondent of the English *Christian World*, signing himself "Biblicus," and whom the editor represents as being "a venerable and learned minister of the Congregational body." In reply to Mr. Spurgeon's declaration that abandoning the doctrine of endless torments is evidence of "philosophical infidelity," he says,

"It is well he does not include in his lament the cause of that surrender. He cannot be ignorant that devout and conscientious men — men who, like himself, would lay down their lives to honor God and serve their generation for Christ's sake, have ceased to hold his view of hell, not because they are infidel, or sceptical, or philosophical, but because, renouncing rationalism and tradition, in which Mr. Spurgeon's hell was born and baptized, and confirmed, and is to this day, even by himself, nourished and patronized — renouncing these corruptions of Christian doctrine, they are determined to *abide by the Scriptures*. They are determined, in spite of traditional and philosophical clamor, to 'hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.' They believe that God, by his Spirit in *the word*, has informed them better on that subject than any theology can do; and they are resolved to place more faith in the 'words which the Holy Ghost teacheth' than in any time-honored but man-uttered words whatever.

By describing the punishment of hell as a doom under which 'every vein is a road for the hot feet of pain to travel on,' and making it more horrible in physical sufferings than severest bodily tortures can even suggest, you put into the hands of the Catholic an instrument of superstition which enables him to bring devotees to his feet cringing and paralyzed in reason and intellect, in conscience and heart, in imagination and will. Terror-stricken and bewildered, prostrate in every faculty, they fling themselves into the arms of a sacerdotal class without inquiry, satisfied with their bold assurance that to them are entrusted the mystic rights of delivering a sinner from the 'bitter pains' of 'everlasting suffering.' You can forge no weapon, fulminate no terrors, so serviceable to the sacramentalist as the popular doctrine of hell."

Recently a new work of over five hundred pages, on the great question of Redemption, has been issued by Longmans, Green & Co., of London, with the title of "Complete Triumph of Moral Good

over Evil." It consists of four chapters; the first stating the question as it obtains to-day in the religious world, in which he shows the contrast between the present Christian treatment of Criminals and the future treatment of them by God according to the theory of orthodox theologians; the second, demonstrating the truth of the Bible and the superiority of the Gospel; the third, investigating the various grounds of belief in Endless Punishments as set forth by Calvinism, Arminianism, etc.; and the fourth, presenting in elaborate form the rational and scriptural proofs of Universalism. We have room only for a single paragraph as a specimen of the author's style of argument:

"I believe it is false and calumnious to assert that the essential and pre-eminent quality of the Divine Nature — love — could be satisfied in the contemplation of never-ending anguish and corruption, as would the allegation that an affectionate mother could be happy while one of her children was in a state of misery. It is a necessity of the Divine Nature, as it is exhibited in the Bible, to seek the welfare of all his creatures. Their errors, weaknesses, follies, crimes and ingratitude will not prevent the accomplishment of his gracious purposes towards them. The beautiful parables of the Saviour indicate how greatly the Creator, and all pure and benevolent beings, are moved at the sight of sin and sorrow. It may, I think, be said that the salvation of one sinner would be a guarantee that all would be saved, as it would prove that the difficulties of the case (which are identical in principle, though differing in the degree of perversity and depravity) were not insurmountable."

The Jews in Rome.

THE condition of the Jews in Rome has for some ages past been such as to call forth on the one hand the extremest sympathy and pity of foreigners visiting the papal city; and on the other the severest denunciations of a government which, claiming to be specially ordained of God, could commit such atrocities, such abominable cruelties and crimes, in the name of his Son. The Ghetto is known of every one who has been in Rome, or read of Rome, as the Jewish quarter. Within this narrow and miserable district are huddled nearly five thousand Jews; imprisoned, as it were, literally penned up, the huge iron gates being closed at nightfall, and no one allowed to go out or in till morning. The streets of the Ghetto are narrow and crowded; in some cases so narrow that, as we well remember in

riding through them, the driver is obliged to swing the shutters to in order to give room for the carriage to pass. Poverty, filth, wretchedness, are everywhere present; mouldy, decaying, dark, ill-ventilated dwellings; while pale, sickly, careworn faces, bent forms, and scowling looks, meet you on all sides.

By a bull of Gregory XIII., A. D. 1584, all Jews over twelve years of age were compelled to listen once a week to a sermon from some Christian priest, in which they were denounced as the children of the murderers of Christ, the enemies of God, and firebrands of hell. And on a church opposite one of the gates of the Ghetto is a painting of the Crucifixion, underneath which is an inscription in Hebrew and Latin from Isa. lxv. — "I have spread out my hands all day to a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that was not good, after their own thoughts; a people that provoketh me to anger continually to my face."

But to the account which has suggested these remarks. It is abridged from the *London Daily News*, and furnishes some interesting facts in regard to the treatment of the Jews by the Papal Church, which will enable the reader to judge how far this church fulfils the Saviour's injunction, "Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you," etc.

"Of this wretched population — wretched beyond expression — miserably crushed down by a secular bigotry and oppression, nearly one-half are daily making the streets and squares of Rome echo with cries — the Italian equivalents of 'old clo'.' What episodes of misery, what epochs of persecution are not suggested by their bent forms and their thin, querulous cries! The horrid den in which they are cooped up was assigned to them about the middle of the sixteenth century, by Pope Paul IV., with the benevolent view of preserving Catholics from the fatal contagion of their intercourse. Pius V. managed to improve even on the rigor of the stern Caraffa; he found time amidst his plotting against Elizabeth and the Huguenots to make the iron enter more deeply into the souls of his own Jewish subjects; he kept them immured in the Ghetto as closely as galley slaves. When by chance a wretched Hebrew was descried in the streets, the hue and cry was given, and he was hunted back to the common den, or worse still, dragged to the cells of the Inquisition.

In 1847 permissions were given for the first time to Jews to dwell beyond the precincts of the Ghetto; but even then only in its immediate vicinity. The permissions, however, were never granted in a legal form; not even in writing. They were only a verbal permission of the Cardinal Vicar, which might at any moment be recalled on the complaint of the first Catholic house proprietor who took it

into his head to regard their proximity to him as a cause of civil or religious scandal. The Jews were in all respects the pariahs of society. To vex and oppress them was a thing pleasing to God and man. Their testimony was not considered as valid in any court of law, so that a Christian who killed a Jew in the presence of twenty Jewish witnesses remained unpunished for want of proof. They could not possess real property — a disqualification which unhappily existed too long in countries more enlightened.

They were debarred from all the liberal professions, from attendance on the public schools and academies — the only exception in their favor being the permission to attend the medical lectures at the University. A Jew might thus become a physician or a surgeon, but could only practice amongst the members of his own communion. Under no conceivable circumstances was it permitted to him to exercise the healing art on a Christian, not even though the Christian had been struck down by his side on the public highway in a fit of apoplexy which the immediate use of his lancet might have relieved. Nor was that all. The prejudice or caprice of the Cardinal Vicar frequently prohibited the Jewish practitioner, when once licensed, from practising in Rome or the Papal provinces, so that he was driven from his family, and compelled to wander forth to earn his bread in some foreign state.

It has required the whole influence of the house of Rothschild, brought with a direct pressure on the Papal Government, to obtain, but very recently, from Pius IX., permission for some of the young co-religionists of the great financiers to attend the mathematical lectures at the University. One Roman Jew obtained permission to prosecute his artistic studies at the Academy of St. Luke. And last year, for the first time, one young Jew received permission to attend — but the order expressly stated, in the character of a simple hearer — the public lectures on law. The jealousy of the priestly government, and its traditions of persecution towards the Jews were not confined to the liberal professions. A Jew was not allowed to be a locksmith. Jews capable of making locks and keys would likewise be capable of entering, without the knowledge of the owners, Christian houses.

After this fashion the Papacy did justice to the Jew. Let us now see how, when he was concerned, it loved mercy. Papal Rome abounds in charitable institutions. Its defenders and admirers in foreign countries have of late been proclaiming this fact to the whole world, and even have been attempting to establish contrasts between Catholic and Protestant charity, to the disparagement of the latter. But the charitable institutions of Rome, however beneficent to the Catholic, were inexorably closed against the Jew. The State made no provision for them in their poverty or their sickness. Nor could private Jewish charity, through the obstacles thrown in its way by government, supply as it might have wished the shortcomings of the State. Such an institution as the truly admirable Jewish hospital in

the Via Cavour in Florence, founded and presided over by the Chev. Levi — such an admirable institution, a perfect model of cleanliness, ventilation, paternal care, and constant professional skill exercised towards the inmates, would have been utterly impossible in the Roman Ghetto. In the first period of his reign, Pius IX. ordered a sum of three hundred dollars to be annually paid to relieve the poverty and sickness of the Jews there. But three hundred dollars could no more meet such a want than a single cup of water would have allayed the raging thirst of the sufferers in the 'black hole' of Calcutta. Both the suffering and the poverty were the necessary consequences of a system. The two thousand old Jewish clothes men who prowl about Rome and its neighborhood are the natural creations of such a state of things. To carry on their trade they too required, till very lately, a special permission. And in practice this still continued to be the case until the overthrow of the Papal Government a few weeks ago, for it was always in the power of any subordinate papal functionary to prevent the old clothes man from carrying on his trade in the provinces, and to send him back to Rome.

And it must never be forgotten that whilst the Roman Jews paid all the taxes levied on the other classes of citizens, they paid a further series of special imposts. These took their rise in the following way: Pope Julius III. had levied a tax of ten golden scudi on each of the synagogues — in his reign one hundred and fifteen in number — in the States of the Church. Paul IV. suppressed all these synagogues, with three exceptions — those of Rome, Ancona and Avignon. There ensued a corresponding deficit in the income of the Casa Catecumenica, of which these taxes formed a part. However, the Papal Chancellor of the Exchequer of those days found a rough and ready way of meeting the deficit. The Jews of Rome itself had additional taxes imposed on them to make up for the loss of the sums no longer flowing in from the one hundred and twelve suppressed synagogues. The Jews of Rome were laden with a fresh pecuniary burden, because one hundred and twelve other Jewish communities were debarred from exercising the rites of their faith! Clement VIII. somewhat reduced these burdens. They were, however, again increased by Urban VIII.

This mass of organized suffering and wrong, these iniquities perpetrated in the name of religion, must long leave their traces on the Jewish community of Rome. But the first great step for the removal has, Heaven be praised, been taken, by their admission to equal civil rights by the Royal decree. Let those persons who in other countries invoke the holiest names, the most sacred interests, in their attempt to re-establish the temporal authority of the Pope, think deeply and seriously on the responsibility which they assume, in even daring to propose for the approval of the civilized and Christian world the planting afresh a tree which has borne such fruits."

Causes of Crime.

THE "New York Prison Association," one of the most noble institutions in the country, thoroughly alive and active, and blessed with officers and assistants not afraid of work, is doing valuable service in the cause of humanity, of criminal legislation and prison discipline, by its extended and intelligent inquiries into the causes of crime, and its classification of criminals according to the results of these inquiries. There can be no wise legislation on this all-important subject, no satisfactory effort to stop the growth of crime and reform criminals, until we know something of the antecedents of this class, something of the circumstances, the domestic, social, moral and educational conditions leading to, and producing, the crime. And this is the work which the Association above named has prescribed for itself; and the results of their investigations in the State of New York and elsewhere are given in their "Twenty-fifth Annual Report," from which we made some extracts in our last on the question whether criminals can be reformed. The causes or sources of crime as set forth in this Report are given as below:

"1st. Want of due parental care and government. 2d. Drunkenness. Two-thirds of all prisoners questioned 'acknowledged that they were of intemperate habits, and a considerable portion of the remaining third that they occasionally drank to intoxication, while scarcely one in a hundred has claimed to be a total abstinent.' 3d. Lewdness. 'Of nearly sixty thousand women committed to our jails in one year, more than three-fourths were prostitutes; and of the men interrogated, nearly one-half have confessed that they were frequenters of brothels.' 4th. 'Theatres are but the vestibule of the grog-shop and the brothel.' 'Nearly fifty per cent. of the persons committed to prison admit that they have been theatre-goers.' 5th. The gambling saloon is a great crime-producer. 'Of nine hundred and seventy-five prisoners at Auburn, three hundred and seventeen were by their own confession gamblers. 6th. Then comes ignorance. One-third of the inmates of our common jails cannot even read, while one-fifth can read but not write. In the State of New York only two and seven-tenths of the adult population are unable to read, while thirty-one per cent. of the criminals do not possess that ability. It thus appears that nearly one-third of the crime in this State is committed by a class of persons comprehending only about two-hundredths of the population.'

Other sources of crime — some more, some less prolific — as ascertained by the researches of this society, and spread out in detail on the pages of our reports, are: bad books; orphanage; pauperism; insanity; the carelessness of police officers in making arrests; ineffi-

cient preventive police; immigration; proximity to great thoroughfares; density of population; want of early religious training; neglect of church; Sabbath-breaking; and lack of ministerial instruction."

Here is opened a wide field for thought and effort. Legislators and philanthropists, reformers and magistrates, will find here work enough to do, and which if once done well, will save incalculable work in the future. It is idle to be forever engaged in clearing out the lower channels of the stream, while the foul and poisoned fountains are left unheeded to send out their deadly waters. Begin at the source of the stream, clear out the head-springs, make everything pure and healthful there, and all the useless labor down the river will be saved; and all the people living along its banks will not only be secure from danger, but will rejoice in the beauty and fragrance and fertility which come into the place of deformity, barrenness and desolation.

This Report should be studied by those who make laws, and those who administer them, and by the officials of all our prisons, penitentiaries, houses of correction, and especially those having charge of juvenile vagrants and offenders. It should be in the hands of city magistrates and of the selectmen of our towns, and in every police office in the land. And let us add farther, that preachers will find it profitable to give the facts named a patient consideration, and they will discover in them that which will make their preaching direct and practical; matter for sermons which will come home to the hearts, the business, the social and domestic life of the people.

The Mystery of Easter Island.

In the *Quarterly* for last July we gave a brief notice, in an article on "Antiquarian Discoveries," of the monuments found in this little island in the midst of the Pacific Ocean. There is a mystery about the matter well calculated to excite the interest of the antiquarian, the geologist, and all engaged in investigating the primitive condition of the earth and its inhabitants. Easter Island is three thousand miles from the nearest continent, and fifteen hundred miles from the nearest inhabited land, and is only about forty miles in circumference. It is barren, without trees, and inhabited by a few savages who lead a most miserable existence. It has recently been visited by a party of learned and scientific men who have given us the benefit of their observations as follows:

"Upon this narrow strip of land, so barren and unproductive, the astonished eye of the explorer beholds a forest of gigantic stone statues, about the origin and meaning of which the race dwelling around them knows absolutely nothing. The smallest of these statues measure twenty feet in height, while many measure thirty feet, and a few attain the incredible dimensions of fifty feet. Some repose upon long platforms constructed in the cyclopean manner; the greater portion of them wear crowns about six feet in height, formed of volcanic tufa, which have evidently been placed upon these statues after their erection. The foreheads of the statues are retreating and the mouths prominent, which indications may probably reveal the race who constructed them. As regards the workmanship displayed upon them, it is rude and clumsy, although not destitute of character and expression.

The questions concerning them, presented for solution, are, what do they represent? whose handiwork are they? and how came they there? There are no metals in Easter Island, nor even silex; only a few hard species of stone are found capable of being fashioned into axes, with which perhaps those mysterious statues were hewn. The stone of which they are composed is found neither upon the island nor upon any of the surrounding islands; their number, dimensions and character forming a strange contrast to the narrowness and poverty of the place whereon they are constructed. How could this barren island have nourished a race of men capable of raising such monuments? where is this race? and what country do they still inhabit?

In reply to these speculations, several scientific men of great authority hazard the opinion that the island in question is only one of the summits of the submerged continent which geological evidence proves at one time to have occupied the whole of that part of the Pacific which is now called Polynesia. Several also show grounds for believing that the statues in question present a Mexican physiognomy, and may have been the work of one of the kindred races of that people. Several of these monuments are now on their way to the British Museum, where, it is hoped, additional light will be thrown upon them."

Religious World.

Some curious facts have recently come to light illustrating the religious condition of the masses in France, and the trade-and-traffic spirit ruling the priests in the business of saving souls, and easing the pains of those in purgatory. At present it seems that an ordinary mass costs about an English shilling, or twenty-four cents. This, says the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the French clergy complain of as too low by one half. Several of the curés have memorialized their Bishops on the subject, and from their reports it appears that, owing to the

cheapness of the terms, some four million masses are annually applied for! And it is said that one-third of these are engaged and paid for by young men who are going to draw at the military conscription, young girls who want their love affairs to prosper, and old women who have invested money and are afraid of ruin; all hoping through the mass or communion to secure the Divine favor in their behalf:

"The result is that in large towns, and especially in Paris, there are more masses ordered than could be recited by twice the number of priests in the diocese, granting even that they officiated incessantly from morning to night; so that it has become a practice to sub-let or farm out the masses to country priests who have more time to spare. For instance, when a person orders at a Paris church one, ten, or as the case may be, several hundred, masses, he pays his money and gives his name; but, unless he be a rich man and pays generously, his masses are not said in Paris. The order is remitted to some poor curé in the provinces, who takes, as it were, a wholesale commission, and recites the masses for about fourpence a piece. It thus often happens that a tradesman who dies in Paris is prayed for, day after day, in the wilds of Languedoc, where nobody has ever seen or heard of him. However, a good number of provincial curés are growing tired of saying masses at second-hand prices; and, as the urban priests maintain that it is impossible to allow them more than one-third of the original fee — the rest being required to defray the great expenses incumbent upon town churches — it is thought that the Pope should take the matter into consideration and suffer the fees to be increased."

— The following from an article in the December *Old and New* on the Chinese merchants of San Francisco, will serve to offset some of the harsher statements of "Why and How" noticed in this number of the *Quarterly*. It is a beautiful illustration of obedience to the Golden Rule, and might put to shame some Christian merchants for their selfish neglect of the interests of a deceased partner's widow and children.

"One evening, my wife and I sat with Ah Ying in his private office until late at night. Extremely reserved on short acquaintance, and very reticent, when he felt inclined he was a ready talker. This evening, he told us much of his past life, — how he came to California, in the early days, poor and friendless; how, in spite of abuse, oppressive laws, and local prejudice, he hired a little cellar, and established himself in business; how he grew in prosperity, and his business increased, until that cellar has now grown into four stories of a fine brick building, besides his establishment in China.

'You have any partners, Ah Ying?' I asked.

'Oh, yes! I have partner. I got one partner dead; my partner all same; no different. I make all I can; he have share. He have wife, children, home in China. Every year I look over rice, oil, tea, flour, see how much make; then send China, pay him, his wife, all he make. Suppose live, my partner; dead, my partner all same.' "

The writer, speaking of the San Francisco Chinese merchants, says they are "a noble body of men, cultivated in manners, educated in mind, and have borne for many years the arrogance which power allied with ignorance always produces. In a city largely controlled by Irish influence, they have succeeded, by years of integrity so marked as to win approval from even their enemies, in making the credit of their nation as merchants unimpeachable."

— The Spanish Government proposes to reduce the dioceses from sixty-one to sixteen, the parishes from twenty thousand to eight thousand, and the state allowance from $8,500,000 to $3,000,000, leaving the people to provide for what more is needed. The bill proposes to give the clergy the same rights as other citizens and no more, and takes from the bishops all temporal jurisdiction.

— The "Speaker's Commentary," which has been in progress seven years, it is expected will be published early in January. It forms a handsome volume of eight hundred pages, with explanatory and critical notes, and, where necessary, a revision of the translation, correcting all ascertained errors; and to mark this distinctly, every corrected passage or word is printed in a special type.

— Henrich Ritter, author of "History of Ancient and Christian Philosophy," who died in February, 1869, left a work on *Evil and its Consequences* (Ueber das Bose und seine Folgen. Gotha. 1869), in which he says, "The good belongs to the essential nature of man, the evil to its consequences"; and after an elaborate discussion of the theme in all its relations, states his conclusion thus: "The result of our theory is, in evil are complications and retrogressions of the moral life, but neither something purely negative, estimated morally, nor something absolutely damnable that must be regarded as incorrigibly opposed to the good."

— The *Friend of India*, giving an account of a recent celebration of the once famous religious festival of India, that of *Juggernauth*, has the following, which shows how rapidly the old Hindoo idolatry

is losing its hold on the people. These things, more than the number of conversions, show the silent but potent disintegrating influence which Christian thought and intercourse are exerting upon the ancient pagan systems of this strange and wonderful land. To appreciate the paragraph fully, the reader should compare it with descriptions of the countless crowds, the enthusiasm, religious fury, costly offerings, and self-sacrifices under the crushing wheels of the car, which fifty years ago attended the festival of this Idol:

"The Juggernauth festival at Serampore closed on Monday after a pitiable fashion. The two great cars stand on the roadside, half in the ditch, because the people will not pull them back to their places. In spite of the numbers hired to pull and to applaud, the cars were moved on the first occasion only half the usual distance, and there they lie in the mud, with the idols on them and flags flying. As usual, the Brahmins applied to the authorities to 'order' the people to pull, but of course in vain. The common peasantry was heard to reply to the miserable creatures who urged them from the car to pull, 'It is all very well, but come and give a hand yourself.' The crowd, of which a rough census was taken, was never more than seventy-five thousand at the highest, and rarely exceeded thirty-five thousand — a third of what it used to be. For one man there were fifty women and children."

— The following is from the *New York Observer*, a journal which is the very incarnation of Orthodoxy after the strictest sect. It is amusing, significant and prophetic. We may surely hope that Aaron Burr, vile as he was, will be saved, when we consider that he was a cousin of "the good Dr. Dwight," and had "godly parents and grandparents." It reminds us of the Catholic doctrine regarding certain saints who, having a surplus of good deeds, more than enough to secure their own salvation, are easily persuaded by the priest to transfer them to the account of some poor sinner, whose deficiency would otherwise result in his damnation. But, seriously, does not the paragraph show the difficulties of Orthodoxy, and the straits to which it is sometimes driven in attempting to escape the logic of its creed. If "no one is authorized to say" that Aaron Burr is damned, notwithstanding his depraved heart and corrupt life, will the *Observer* be good enough to mention some one respecting whom we *are* authorized to say that? We suppose that the greatest of sinners have all had *some* godly ancestors, and so there is a chance for every one on this ground. True is it that

"Error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers:"

"Now we know that the Lord loves to do great things for his people. We know that Aaron Burr, a most degenerate son, had most godly parents and grandparents. We know that God is infinite. We know that a thief was saved in the agonies of the Cross. With God all things are possible. Who shall limit his grace or his power? We do not know that the great and good Dr. Dwight will ever meet his cousin, Aaron Burr, in the New Jerusalem; but no one is authorized to say that he never will."

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

1. A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, with special reference to Ministers and Students. By John Peter Lange, D. D. Vol. VII. of the New Testament; containing the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. Charles Scribner & Co.

We have regularly called attention to this learned and useful work, as each volume has come from the press. It has no equal in the English language, as a help to the critical reading of the New Testament. It is not without grave faults as regards its Doctrinal matter; and its Homiletical essays could be dispensed with in many cases without injury to the student or preacher; but its Critical apparatus, its information touching early manuscripts and versions, its accumulated stores of learning from all sources, ancient and modern, render it of inestimable value to the biblical scholar, and to the minister who writes and preaches with an honest desire to inform and teach his people. Sometimes the pages are rather overloaded with learning, and the reader is confused with the conflicting authorities and opinions; but disregarding opinions and editorial criticisms altogether, there is still left abundant critical material out of which to construct his own interpretations and conclusions. The Universalist student will often be compelled to this course, and sometimes the intellectual and logical drill necessary to this will be of great service. As an exercise of this sort we would point to the notes, textual, critical, doctrinal, and homiletical, on Ephesians i.

The New Testament part of this great work wants now only the commentaries on John's Gospel and Revelations for its completion. The first may be looked for early in the spring, and the last will be in the hands of the translator as soon as the original is issued in Germany. The Old Testament also is progressing as fast as the vast extent and difficult nature of the work will admit. When complete, what a monument of learning, industry and enterprise this work will furnish! Authors, Translators and Publishers may justly be proud of it.

2. The Sermons of Henry Ward Beecher, in Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. From Verbatim Reports by T. J. Ellinwood. "Plymouth Pulpit." First, Second and Third Series 3 vols. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. For sale by Noyes, Holmes & Co.

Henry Ward Beecher is probably the most remarkable preacher in America; not for his manner, or the magnetism of his personal address, for we do not think these are anything extraordinary — but for his *thought;* for the fertility of his resources and the wealth of his imagery; for the fervor of his rhetoric; for the variety, beauty, range and marvellous felicity of his illustrations and comparisons; for the freshness, vivacity and vigor with which he presents his subject to the hearer; for his ability to bring religion into the most common transactions of business and social life; for his power to quicken the conscience, and awaken the devotional feelings; for his large and catholic spirit; for the boldness of his speech; and, finally, for the genuine earnestness of his nature, the thorough goodness of his heart, as shown especially in his late sermon on "Eternal Punishment."

All these qualities of mind and heart, all these marked features of his sermonizing, all these forces which have contributed so much to the immense success and usefulness of his ministry, are manifest throughout this large collection of his discourses. Everywhere we see the evidence of his genius, and the astonishing power with which the Bible, nature, science, art, and life in all its shifting phases, are made tributary to his striking appeals to the consciences and feelings of men.

It is easy to see that Mr. Beecher is not only a preacher, but a man among men; that he lives not in his study alone, and among his books, but in the world, among the people to whom his messages are to be addressed. He sees life as it is lived every day amid the temptations of toil and business and politics and pleasure; as it is lived in the homes of the virtuous and good, and in the haunts of the vicious and criminal; in the palaces of the rich, and in the hovels of the poor. He walks through the streets of the city, and through the fields of the country, with his eyes and ears and heart all open and receptive, ready to observe, to learn and profit by every lesson that God or Man may teach him. He looks nature in the face, sees her freshness and beauty and beneficence; and strengthened by the communion, he goes into the pulpit and talks of the Divine goodness and glory like one inspired. He looks sin and wrong in the face, and sees all their ugliness and deformity; and stirred by the baleful sight, he launches his maledictions against them with all the vehemence of the old prophets, and in words that strike like solid shot. He comes into contact with the sorrows and griefs, the woes and miseries, of the neglected and outcast; and, instantly, his voice drops into the gentlest speech, and all the tenderness of the man's nature goes out to comfort, encourage and bless the sufferers.

And so through all the phases of human life and experience. He sees as by intuition all the demands of each case as it comes before him, and on the moment the word that needs to be spoken, and the

way in which it should be spoken to make it most effectual. His sermons are the outpouring of what is best in the man; what he has learned, seen and felt, during the week, from his communion with God and nature, his self-introspection, and his daily walk among his fellows. In a word, they are the offspring of the marriage of Religion to Life — a union which every preacher should celebrate in his sermons and in all the labors of his ministry.

In conclusion, we commend these volumes to preachers of all creeds, as more informing and suggestive than a dozen courses of professional lectures on Homiletics, or the art of preaching.

3. Outline of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy. A Text-Book for Students. By the Rev. J. Clarke Murray, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, Queen's University, Canada. With an Introduction by the Rev. James McCosh, LL. D., President of Princeton College, N. J. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

A useful manual for those who seek an acquaintance with a system of Philosophy which has exerted a very positive influence on the speculative and religious thought of our day. It is clear and compact in its definitions of philosophical terms, systematic in its arrangement and treatment of the various phenomena of mental science, and generally discriminating in its separation of the known from the unknown — in other words, what is demonstrated and established from what is only guessed at. Its value as a text-book is greatly enhanced by its conscientious reference of every statement and doctrine to the chapter and page of the originals of Sir William, where the reader, if in doubt, will find the subject treated *in extenso*.

4. Why and How. Why the Chinese Emigrate, and the Means they adopt for the Purpose of Reaching America. With Sketches of Travel, Amusing Incidents, Social Customs, etc. By Russell H. Conwell. With Illustrations by Hammatt Billings. Lee & Shepard.

An odd title to a very entertaining book, the object of which is to give us information of the government, character, superstitions and social peculiarities of the Chinese; and especially of the causes, motives, expectations and results of Chinese Emigration to this country. How far the statements are reliable we are not able to say; but the author differs in some important matters from books we have been accustomed to regard as authority. Still we have been much interested in some of his graphic sketches.

The Chinese labor question, and the relations of the Celestials to our country, its government, laws, customs, and the duties and obligations of citizenship, are discussed at length; and with many suggestions useful to those among us, who are about entering into the experiment of employing this strange people in agriculture, mining, manufacturing, or domestic service.

The revelations respecting the Coolie trade are a repetition of the horrors of the African Slave trade. The record given of the tyranny and corruption of provincial governors, of the robbery and extortion in the imposition and collection of taxes, the bribery of judges and

law officers, the league between criminals and government officials, if one did not read carefully, might be taken for a chapter in the history of New York City, or of our Internal Revenue System. Competitive Literary Examinations, described with so much admiration by some writers, are pronounced a farce, since money will purchase any kind of a certificate signed, sealed and sworn to. Education, however, is very general among all classes, and the masses both read and write.[1] For a paragraph describing their superstitions, see *Religious World.*

5. Nature's Aristocracy. By Jennie Collins. Lee & Shepard.

A book on the wrongs of those who work, and the wickedness and tyranny of those who employ them. The argument is exaggerated by making exceptional cases the rule, and reasoning as if poverty were a virtue and wealth a crime. As far as our observation and knowledge go, full as much evil and bad feeling grow from the attempts of labor to oppress capital, as from the attempts of capital to oppress labor. There is a great deal of false sentiment on this point. And as to the wrongs and sufferings of work-women, and the talk of their being driven to shame or starvation, it is simply false, when there are thousands of housekeepers who would welcome capable and reliable servants, give them a good home, and pay them well. The stories the author tells as an answer to this statement fail to meet the demands of the case. She has a good deal to say of women "made to be queens," and men "who should be kings," but who unfortunately do not find kingdoms to their hands. There is doubtless some truth in the book, and reason enough for its utterance, but it is one-sided and partial; and the treatment has more the air of sensational romance, than of a philosophical effort to solve the difficult social problems involved.

6. The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man. Mental and Social Condition of Savages. By Sir John Lubbock, Bart. M. P., F. R. S., author of "Prehistoric Times." D. Appleton & Co.

This is in fact a continuation of "Prehistoric Times," and describes the arts, laws, religions, language, marriage relations, and social and moral condition of modern savages, with a view to ascertain the *primitive* condition of man; taking it for granted that these things represent the natural state of man from the beginning, and that *all* knowledge, civilization and religion is the result of growth and devel-

[1] Since writing the above we have fallen on the following newspaper paragraph which shows the difference between the Chinese Pagan and the Irish Catholic: "There are 11,817 Chinese in San Francisco, as the census returns show, and of these all can read and write. The Irish population shows 6,885 who can neither read nor write, — a sad commentary on the results of misgovernment; while the report of the 'heathen Chinee' shows what the thorough organization of the Central Flowery Land does for the people." We advise our legislators to consider which of these is best qualified for the right of suffrage.

opment. Of this we do not feel as sure as Sir John, especially when we read the first chapters of Genesis; but at all events he has gathered an enormous amount of information from travellers and historians respecting the mental and social condition of the savage races of the earth, if only it is reliable; and whoever has a theory to construct on this point, will find here the material, however loosely put together. It is not a scientific treatment of the question, but it is a really valuable contribution to this end, and much of the matter is curious and amusing, as well as informing. We had marked some five or six paragraphs for quotation, but our narrow space has ruled them out for the present. We shall probably find room for some of them hereafter in the *Religious World.*

7. Lay Sermons, Addresses and Reviews. By Thomas Henry Huxley, LL. D., F. R. S. D. Appleton & Co.

One may be certain, mostly, that on taking up a book from the press of D. Appleton & Co. on any Philosophical, Scientific or Theological subject, he will find something solid and useful, something that will compel him to think, that will help to educate him, and keep him abreast of the times, whether he accepts its theories and believes its doctrines or not. Huxley is one of the representative men in the world of science; perhaps one of the most learned, most extensively read, and absolutely the most accurate and successful observer of natural phenomena living at the present time. What such a man has to say on the questions now agitating the scientific and religious mind, it is worth while for us all to hear. Many persons, well informed, have an impression that Huxley writes really in the interests of Atheism and Materialism. This is a mistake, for he does not belong to that school, but writes in a reverent and candid spirit, though he is not afraid to differ from others, and to question the foundations of belief. He has recently made a strong speech in defence of Bible reading in schools, and Professor Tyndal says, "I once heard him say, in regard to the education of his own children, that if nobody else could be found to do it, he would teach them the Bible himself. In a competitive examination upon the Scriptures, canonical and uncanonical, I would back Mr. Huxley against nine-tenths of the clergy. I say 'uncanonical' because he has also the Apocrypha at his fingers' ends."

In regard to the "Lay Sermon" which has provoked so much criticism, he pleasantly says in his "prefatory letter" to this volume, "The Essay 'On the Physical Basis of Life' was intended to contain a plain and untechnical statement of one of the great tendencies of modern biological thought, accompanied by a protest, from the philosophical side, against what is commonly called Materialism. The result of my well-meant efforts I find to be that I am generally credited with having invented 'protoplasm' in the interests of Materialism." It is rather hard when a soldier is fighting bravely for the government and laws of his country, to be counted in among rebels.

Among other things in this volume will be found that delightful talk on "A Piece of Chalk."

8. The Theology of Christ, from His Own Words. By Joseph P. Thompson. Charles Scribner & Co.

Thoroughly orthodox, yet not without many excellent things wholly independent of sectarian logic and interpretation, as the following, for example:

"A Gentile who embraced the Jewish faith was admitted into the Jewish commonwealth by baptism, and was said to be born again. It was a phrase common among the Rabbis—'The Gentile that is made a proselyte, and the servant that is made free, behold he is like a child new-born.' A heathen brought to the knowledge of the true God and received into the commonwealth of his worshippers, began a new life, had new thoughts, new feelings, new principles, new aims, new associations, new hopes, was like one born into a new world. Such was the theory of the school of doctors to which Nicodemus belonged, concerning the receiving a Gentile into the household of Israel."

But in all this there is nothing miraculous or supernatural; and if, therefore, the Saviour had used the phrase in the orthodox sense, he could not properly have rebuked Nicodemus for not understanding him. The truth is, he used it in the sense "common among the Rabbis," and hence the absurdity of Nicodemus' taking it in a literal sense, and the justice of Christ's exclamation—"Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?"

Our author argues bravely for the resurrection of the body, but in this matter we hand him over to his friend Beecher; and when he so confidently builds the colossal structure of endless punishment on so narrow and shaky a foundation as αἰώνιος, we respectfully suggest a little friendly conversation with his friend Prof. Tayler Lewis.

9. *Scribner's Illustrated Library of Wonders.*

Five more volumes of this excellent and richly-illustrated series are out: "*The Wonders of Acoustics*, or the Phenomena of Sound"; "*Wonderful Balloon Ascents*, or the Conquest of the Skies," "History of Balloons and Balloon Voyages"; "The Wonders of Bodily Strength and Skill in all Ages and in all Countries"; and "The Bottom of the Sea."

This library has deservedly proved one of the most successful enterprises ever undertaken in the publishing line. We are glad to learn that Messrs. Scribner propose to furnish the whole set in a black walnut case for holiday and birthday presents; and also to divide the set into smaller sets put up in the same way—The Wonders of Nature (6 vols.), Wonders of Science (4 vols.), Wonders of Travel and Adventure (4 vols.), etc. Nothing could be more acceptable to the young people. The volume on Balloons will have a special attraction now, when all Paris is depending on them for knowledge of the outside world. But perhaps the most attractive, as well as the most informing, of these later issues is "The Bottom of the Sea."

It is full of most curious, strange and delightsome knowledge, interesting alike to young and old, and which very few persons without scientific culture are familiar with. It has been placed on the shelf among our special favorites. We advise all about making book presents to give this Library of Wonders a careful examination.

10. *Lee & Shepard's Juveniles.* The Boys of Grand Pre School; Lost in the Fog. By the author of the B. O. W. C. Club.

Charley Roberts Series. Charley and Eva Roberts' Home in the West.

The Proverb Series. One Good Turn Deserves Another, and Actions Speak Louder than Words, by Kate J. Neely; and A Wrong Confessed is Half Redressed, by Mrs. Bradley.

Rosa Abbott Series. Pinks and Blues, or the Orphan Asylum.

Double Play; or How Joe Hardy Chose His Friends. By William Everett.

The Helping-Hand Series. The Little Maid of Oxbow. By May Mannering.

Little Prudy Flyaway Series. Little Folks Astray, and Prudy Keeping House. By Sophie May, author of "Dotty Dimple," etc.

Springdale Stories. By Mrs. Samuels. 6 vols., embracing Herbert, Eric, Ennisfellen, Johnstone Farm, Adele, and Nettie's Trial.

Letters Everywhere. Stories and Rhymes for Children. With Twenty-eight Illustrations.

The House on Wheels; or the Stolen Child. Translated from the French. By Miss E. F. Adams.

Onward and Upward Series. Field and Forest, or the Fortunes of a Farmer; and Plane and Plank, or the Mishaps of a Mechanic. By Oliver Optic.

The Beckoning Series. Who Will Win? and Going on a Mission. By Paul Cobden.

The Tone Masters. A Musical Series for Young People. By Charles Barnard. 2 vols. *Handel* and *Haydn*, *Bach* and *Beethoven*.

Here are *twenty-three* volumes, all illustrated, from the press of these indefatigable publishers, who are now looked to by half the children in the land for their winter evening entertainments, as well as for such holiday presents as come in the shape of books. And certainly their numerous issues, so unobjectional in character, generously illustrated, and beautifully printed and bound, justify the expectations and partiality of the little people.

Of course we cannot specially notice these several volumes, but as a whole we can cordially commend them to parents and Sunday Schools. Some of them are very slightly tinctured with dogmas which we reject, as several of the Proverb Series; but as a rule they contain nothing to which the strictest sectarian can object, while with many of them the moral lesson and religious teaching are worthy of special commendation, as in "The Little Maid of Oxbow," "Herbert," "One Good Turn Deserves Another," etc. In these the preceptive is so happily blended with the narrative portion, as to attract rather than weary and repel the young reader. And with these are mingled sometimes history and travel, as in the "Springdale Stories," thus imparting much pleasing and useful information. Mr. Everett's books are worthy of special commendation, as written from a higher level, and with a higher purpose, than most books of their class. We have read Oliver Optic's stories with as much pleasure as if we were a boy, and can understand the secret of his universal popularity. Paul Cobden's stories are written with a noble purpose, and seem, as far as we have examined, well fitted to accomplish it. "Who Will Win?" we would gladly see in the hands of every tempted boy.

11. The Song of the Sower. By William Cullen Bryant. Illustrated with Forty-two Engravings on Wood. D. Appleton & Co.

A perfect gem in every respect; one of the most dainty, delicate and charming books ever sent out from the American press — fit for a bridal gift. The poem is the offspring of one of Bryant's happiest inspirations, all aglow with the mellow lights, and fresh with the fragrant breath, of autumn fields and woods; and the illustrations of its incidents and scenery by Fenn, Hennessy, Perkins and others, are exquisite alike in design and execution. We have lingered over its illuminated and suggestive pages with many pleasant and profitable thoughts, for which we thank both poet and publisher. Nothing we have seen this season is so admirably suited for a gift-book as this.

12. The Monitions of the Unseen, and Poems of Love and Childhood. By Jean Ingelow. Roberts Brothers.

Our admiration of Jean Ingelow was long ago expressed, when the Messrs. Roberts showed their good taste and judgment by the reprint of her first volume. We have never changed our mind in regard to her poetry, though she is unequal in her treatment, and not always successful; as in "A Story of Doom." We do not count the present volume as the peer of her first. "The Monitions of the Unseen" has some beautifully pathetic and descriptive passages in its opening, but the thought, the lesson of the poem, is not wrought out so sharply and effectively as in some other of her productions. "The Mariner's Cave," "Margaret by the Mere-Side," and especially "Margaret in the Xebec," are sweetly plaintive poems, teaching, in a way known to many by a sad experience, the lesson so lately and reluctantly learned by us all — to "Look Up." Perhaps the poem having most tenderness, the most religious sweetness and inspiration in it, is that on "The Deaths of Three Children"; though there is in it an occasional gleam of the writer's theological errors. It will be the first read by many a bereaved father and mother.

13. Miriam and Other Poems. By John Greenleaf Whittier. Fields, Osgood & Co.

What is there to say of Whittier's poetry which has not been said? Who needs anything said as an inducement to read what he writes? This poem of Miriam is a charming Oriental tale, which the poet describes as

> "A fancy with slight hint of truth
> Showing how differing faiths agree
> In one sweet law of charity."

How such a "slight hint" would be wrought out by one of such large charity, of so tolerant, loving and gentle a spirit, can easily be imagined without a lengthy setting out of the argument of the poem.

But beside the Christian lesson taught, it has some of those dainty pictures from nature which lend such a charm to the writings of Whittier. It opens with one of these, briefly sketching the surround-

ings of the village (Amesbury), the river, the far-off shore and sea, the quiet of the Sabbath, and the scene and conversation which suggested the poem. Then follows the psalm of the "sweet singer," with its lesson of wisdom and Christian charity.

We are glad to find gathered into the volume some of the more recent poems of Whittier, till now scattered in magazines, and not readily accessible; as "Norembega," "Nauhaught the Deacon," "The Laurels," "Howard at Atlanta," and "In School Days," which — we may as well say it — is the sweetest thing in the book.

14. The Life and Times of John Huss; or the Bohemian Reformation of the Fifteenth Century. By E. H. Gillett, Professor of Political Science in the New York City University. 2 vols. Third Edition, carefully Revised, with important Additions and an Appendix. Gould & Lincoln.

For a full and particular notice of this exceedingly able and valuable work, we refer our readers to the *Quarterly* for 1864, pp. 121, 122, where they will find a statement of its merits, and the grounds of our commendation. The present edition is improved by the addition of new and important facts drawn chiefly from Palacky's recent works, "Documenta" and "Geschichte des Bohmans," which contain much fresh material that has been gathered from various and hitherto unexplored sources.

As we have said before, in substance, those who read these volumes will perhaps be inclined to transfer some of their admiration and homage from Luther to Huss and Jerome. Prof. Gillett has done a work of justice to these men, too long delayed, for which we heartily thank him. We assure our readers that they cannot know all the story of the Reformation until they make themselves familiar with the contents of these volumes, elucidating as they do an important and mostly little known period of political and church history; and bringing out from comparative obscurity the life and labors of those who have been overshadowed by the greater, but not more deserved, glory of the German Reformer.

15. The Highest Law. By Rev. D. M. Hodge. Author's Edition. New Haven: W. H. Peck.

This book is written in an earnest spirit, and with a generous aim; it contains many things respecting legislation and crime, the vices and moral corruptions of society, the abominations of the Rum-traffic, and the dangerous elements working up into our American civilization, which deserve the serious consideration of magistrates and people — but we fear its usefulness will be greatly hindered by the style in which these things are stated. We had hoped that the Carlyle fever, or measles, which raged so furiously some twenty-five years ago, would never inflict itself upon the literary world again; but it seems to have broken out in this book with fresh fury and virulence. At the time named, we had a very severe and dangerous attack, but by help of faithful friends we recovered; and we have no doubt our

young friend will in good time. There is one thing to encourage him — we never knew a case in this country to prove fatal.

By and by he will be satisfied that if he has anything to say, the best way is to say it in as plain and direct speech as possible; will abandon such words as "prœmial," "aguire," "alogy," "benempt," "agrise," "Dipsas," "levigate," and express his thought in terms which the "common people" can understand without the constant use of Worcester's or Webster's Unabridged. The man who in these days has anything worth saying, and says it in clear, compact, straightforward English, is the man most likely to be read.

Mr. Hodge has something worth saying, and hence our regret that his thought is hampered and robbed of its rights, by his unfortunate choice of style. Any one reading his book to the end will find much in it that will help him to see the evils of the time more clearly, and show him where the path of duty will surely lead him, if he has courage to follow it.

16. *Books of Universalist Publishing House.* Primitive Christianity and its Corruptions. Department of Theological Doctrines. Discourses delivered in Hopedale, Mass., 1869—70. By Adin Ballou.

Proceedings of the Universalist Centennial held in Gloucester, Mass., Sept. 20, 21, 22.

The Gospel Liturgy: A Prayer-Book for Churches, Congregations and Families. Prepared by Direction of the General Convention of Universalists.

Songs of Joy: For Sunday Schools and Homes. Compiled by G. L. Demarest.

A Denominational Offering from the Literature of Universalism, in Twelve Parts. By Rev. Norris C. Hodgdon.

These fresh issues of the Publishing House show that it is alive, and active in the cause of denominational literature. "Primitive Christianity" is a work embodying the results of much thought, study and reading. It is the first of three volumes, the second of which will treat of "Personal Righteousness," and the third of "Ecclesiastical Polity," following the same course of argument and illustration. We have space here for only a brief statement of the plan and contents of the volume, as we shall probably give it in a future number a more extended examination and review. Mr. Ballou takes up the following points: 1. The Relationship of Jesus Christ to God the Father; his real Nature, Dignity and Authority. 2. The Nature, Relationship and Office of the Holy Spirit. 3. The Nature and Efficacy of the Atonement. 4. Angelology, Demonology, and Resurrection from the Dead; or the Doctrine of Spiritual and Immortal Existence. 5. Regeneration and Salvation. 6. Divine Government, Judgment, Retribution and Discipline. 7. The Final Destiny of Mankind.

In treating these subjects, the author first states the Primitive Doctrine; then endeavors to verify and defend it by abundant citations from the sacred text; and finally shows when and how the primitive doctrine was corrupted, by equally abundant testimonials from Church Fathers and Writers. Mr. Ballou has long been known as a diligent and intelligent student of the Bible and of Church Creeds, and as a patient and candid observer of religious life and phenomena; and

what he has to say on these subjects as the results of life-long thought and labor is, therefore, entitled to respectful consideration. We have looked over his volume with great interest, and while we differ from him on some points very decidedly, we find much with which we are pleased and instructed. But we cannot, in the small space left us, enter into particulars. All who read the book will find plenty of food for thought, much that is suggestive of inquiry, and some things provoking controversy.

"The Gospel Liturgy," by Rev. A. C. Thomas, is too well known among us to need any special notice. We have only this to say, that as a book for family worship it should be more generally in use. The Selections are well suited to responsive morning service at the table. This edition is gotten up in excellent taste; good paper, red edges, and exceedingly neat binding.

We cannot speak professionally of the "Songs of Joy," but it is enough to say that it is by Rev. Mr. Demarest. His long experience in Sunday Schools, his knowledge of music, his taste in the selection and adaptation of hymns, are all proof that the book will be found perfectly suited to the purposes for which it is prepared.

The "Denominational Offering" is just out as we go to press, too late for examination; but the reputation of the compiler as a diligent reader of all that belongs to the literature of Universalism, is a pledge that his volume is filled with the ripest fruits of the best thought among us.

17. The Children's Crusade: An Episode of the Thirteenth Century. By George Zabriskie Gray. Hurd & Houghton. For sale by Noyes, Holmes & Co., and by Universalist Publishing House.

We will venture to say that the narrative given in this volume will be entirely new to ninety and nine of every hundred who shall read it. We have been over the story of the Crusades again and again, but either we have missed the "Children's Crusade" altogether, or forgotten it altogether; for this strange episode is as new to us as Livingstone's story of Interior Africa. It reads like a fiction. It is difficult to feel that it is real, veritable history; so marvellous and unnatural and unchildlike are all the incidents. It never could have been history except in an age of extreme superstition and fanaticism.

After several crusades, and the destruction of hundreds of thousands of lives, Innocent III., in the beginning of the thirteenth century, attempted to rouse the people of Europe to a new effort to beat back the Moslem hosts from the Holy Land. A horde of priests were sent out to preach a new crusade, and the enthusiasm excited by their fiery exhortations communicated itself to a shepherd boy of Cloyes in France. He was of a nervous and sensitive temperament, and moved by the tales of returning pilgrims, he felt as if called of God to do something toward helping on the great fight against the Infidels. A crafty priest, or returned crusader, announcing himself as Jesus Christ, appeared to the boy at this juncture, and commissioned him

to preach a crusade to the children. Believing without question, he immediately entered on the work, and such was the furore and frenzy created by his preaching, his saintly reputation and reported miracles, that crowds of children began to throng the public roads of France on their way to St. Denys, the headquarters of the boy-prophet. The excitement spread like contagion, and other boys became preachers of the new crusade, and children of both sexes, of all ranks from the peasant to the noble, joined the hundreds of little bands that marched from all sides to swell the increasing army at St. Denys. Parental entreaty and affection, dangers, hunger and exposure, were all set at naught; even the edict of the king commanding them to return to their homes, had no effect. The authority of Stephen, the child-leader and prophet, was supreme.

Soon the madness spread beyond France, and a German rival, named Nicholas, lifted up the banner of the crusade at Cologne. He swept the field like a tornado, and in the summer of 1212 set out for the Holy Land with an army of twenty thousand children! He assured them that the Mediterranean Sea would open at their approach, and let them pass dry-shod. We have not room to repeat the story of their terrible sufferings in the passage of the Alps, of the thickening deaths by fatigue, disease and starvation, of the cruel outrages inflicted upon them in Italy, until, after a march of seven hundred miles, some seven thousand of them, sick, sore, half-naked and half-starved, reached Genoa. Here they expected to see the waters of the Mediterranean part, and open a way for them to the Holy Land. But having waited in vain, and forced by the authorities of the city, they began their march anew. Quarrels arose, Nicholas fell into contempt and disappeared, the crowd broke up into fragments, some reaching Rome, and a few, it is said, embarking for Palestine — to be heard of no more. Another division crossed the Alps by the St. Gothard Pass, thousands of course dying by the way, while a few only reached Southern Italy, and, embarking for Palestine, were never heard of more.

In the mean time, the army of French children, to the number of thirty thousand, was organized, and set off under Stephen for Marseilles, where they too were to find the sea opening before them. But after long delays, seeing no miracle wrought in their behalf, thousands deserted their leader, who is himself lost sight of at this point; and the host at last dwindled down to five thousand, who were kindly offered a free passage to their destination by two *pious* and sympathizing merchants, who *happened* at that time to have seven ships lying in port idle. Two of the vessels were wrecked the second day out, and all on board perished. As for the rest, it was ascertained, *eighteen years afterward*, that these *Christian* merchants sold the children as slaves in Algiers, according to a bargain made with the Saracens before their embarkation!

Such is the story in brief of "The Children's Crusade"; and indeed all the details of superstition, ignorance, religious fanati-

cism, deception, suffering and cruelty considered, it is one of the most astounding passages in the annals of the Church which we have ever read. As we remarked, it seems almost beyond belief as actual history, but such it is; and the author of this book deserves the hearty thanks of the public for his patience and diligent research in bringing into the light this curious episode in the religious history of the middle ages.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Magazines. Do you read the *Old and New?* If not, you are losing a great deal that is pleasing, useful, suggestive, and educating in its influence. The December number has admirable contributions on "Natural and Revealed Religion," "Ah Ying," "Tarry at Home Travel," "The Dying Gladiator"; beside "The Examiner" and "Record of Progress." — Is not the difference between "Old and New" and the "Atlantic" much like that between the select studies and finished periods of Edward Everett's Addresses; and the world-wide sympathies, the genial, practical temper, and the direct, earnest grapple with the problems of every-day life, of Henry Ward Beecher's Sermons? — *Scribner's Monthly*, the first number of which, with its questionable introductory poem, disappointed our expectations, improves with every number. Did ever any other magazine reach an edition of one hundred thousand at its third number? — *The Catholic World* is one of the ablest Theological and Literary magazines of the country. Its searching reviews of Froude's History, though partizan and often unjust, show a wonderfully exact knowledge of the authorities for English history. The December number has an able paper on "The Sources of American History," and a savage onslaught on "Beecherism and its Tendencies." — If asked what American Theological Quarterly, *after the Universalist*, we should take, if we could take but one, our answer would be the *Methodist Quarterly*. To be sure, we should look longingly toward the "Bibliotheca Sacra," and cast a glance at "The New Englander," and others; but taking the several departments of Biblical Criticism, Theological and Philosophical Discussion, Home and Foreign Religious Literature and News, the *Methodist Quarterly* is the most useful and informing publication of its kind that finds its way to our table. — We cannot but renew the commendation of *Appleton's Journal* which we uttered in our last; though we miss from the more recent issues the paragraphs on Biblical and archæological subjects which gave such interest to the earlier numbers. "Picturesque America," with its beautifully-executed sketches, is adding greatly to its attractions. — The *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July last has a summary of Capt. Warren's Report of the doings of the Palestine Exploration Party; and the October number contains a very interesting account of the famous "Moabite Stone" and its inscription, giving the original in Hebrew type, with a translation. There is quite a difference in the measurements of the stone as given in this account, and in that of Capt. Warren's Report.

Elements of Astronomy: Accompanied with numerous Illustrations, a Colored Representation of the Solar, Stellar and Nebular Spectra, and Celestial Charts of the Northern and Southern Hemispheres. By J. Norman Lockyer. Revised and specially Adapted to the Schools of the United States. [The clearest, most condensed, informing and engaging manual of instruction in this fascinating science we have ever taken in hand. It is by one of the most eminent astronomers and discoverers of the time; and is equally adapted to school teaching, and to study, reading and conversational instruction in the family circle. For an example of simple and felicitous illustrations, see *Plane of the Ecliptic*, p. 58.]

Margaret. A Tale of the Real and the Ideal, Blight and Bloom. By Sylvester Judd. Roberts Brothers.

Sam Shirk: A Tale of the Woods of Maine. By George H. Devereux. Hurd & Houghton.

Vick's Illustrated Catalogue and Floral Guide. [If you wish to know all that is worth knowing about Flowers, Vegetables and Seeds, send for the above, inclosing ten cents, and direct to James Vicks, Rochester, N. Y. After that you will write again with a larger inclosure.]

The Social Stage: Original Dramas, Comedies, Burlesques and Entertainments for Home Recreation, Schools and Public Exhibitions. By George M. Baker, author of "An Old Man's Prayer," "The Mimic Stage," etc. Lee & Shepard. [Mr. Baker has won quite a reputation by his marked success in this kind of literature. Several of these compositions were written at the request of teachers in our public schoos, committees of various lyceums, temperance organizations and literary societies, and have been performed with such success that they have become popular favorites. They may be introduced in the social circle at little cost, and will be sure so furnish, during winter evenings, abundant amusement and no little instruction to the young people.]

Appleton's Illustrated Almanac for 1871. *Atlantic Almanac* for 1871. Fields, Osgood & Co.

John Whopper, the News-Boy. With Illustrations. Roberts Brothers.

My Summer in a Garden. By Charles Dudley Warren. With an Introductory Letter by Henry Ward Beecher. Fields & Osgood. [Full of Wit, Wisdom, Observation, and uncommon Common-Sense. If you have a garden, material or moral, read this book; if you hav'nt, read it by all means — it is the next best thing to having one.]

Ten Times One is Ten: The Possible Reformation. A Story in Nine Chapters. By Col. Frederic Ingham. Roberts Brothers. [In his quaint, original and attractive way, Mr. Hale has here opened a rich vein for philanthropists, which, if worked according to the programme, would be a benediction to the world. But for the present, we fear the desired reformation is only *possible* — when it is wrought out into the actual, then comes the millennium.]

Every Day. By the author of "Katherine Morris," etc. Noyes, Holmes & Co. [A book worth reading, illustrating the necessity of wisdom, patience, gentleness and firmness in the training, education and development of the child. Here are two mothers starting from opposite poles of experience and purpose in the management of their daughters, and the results are given in a way to teach parents a useful and much-needed lesson.]

My Apingi Kingdom Kingdom: With Life in the Great Sahara; and Sketches of the Chase of the Ostrich, Hyena, etc. By Paul Du Chaillu. Harper & Brothers. [A volume that informs while it entertains; and this is a marked characteristic of Du Chaillu's juvenile books. He saw the things, he did the things, he mentions; his facts *are* facts, and not sensational creations; and so, while the narrative is fresh, and new, and often intensely exciting, the reader feels that he is dealing with actual life and adventure, and that the animals, places and scenery described by the author are real.]

Valerie Aylmer. A Novel. By Christian Reid. D. Appleton & Co.

Pericles and Aspasia. By Walter Savage Landor. Roberts Brothers. [Pervaded with the spirit of Greek literature when Greece was in her glory, and eloquence and poetry and politics made one year of life at Athens worth ten years anywhere else.]

Gold and Name. By Marie Sophie Schwartz. Translated from the Swedish by Selma Borg and Marie A. Brown. Lee & Shepard.

Aspendale. By Harriet W. Preston. Roberts Brothers. [Some sharp shooting at Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes and his pet theory, not without hitting sometimes, we think; beside some excellent things on Hawthorne and Mrs. Stowe, and a good deal of gossip on other subjects, some sensible, some not so; all strung upon a slender thread of story.]

Crowded out — Notices of Hawes' "Chronology of Ancient and Modern History"; Proctor's "Other Worlds than Ours"; Gould's "Origin and Development of Religious Belief — Christianity"; Arthur Helps' "Essays Written in the Intervals of Business. Howell's "Suburban Sketches," Porter's "Books and Reading"; "Cornell's Physical Geogaaphy," etc.

ARTICLE VII.

Dr. Williamson's Rudiments.

BEFORE proceeding farther, it may be well to stop a moment and note some of the consequences to which this famous scheme of necessity unavoidably leads. Dr. Williamson regards the proofs and reasonings he has advanced in its favor as "absolutely overwhelming." Possibly they may be so; but if the conclusions to which this doctrine necessarily brings us, are at once absurd, immoral, and profane, we are unquestionably justified in suspecting, if not boldly assuming, that there must be some misapprehension of the proofs, or some fallacy in the reasoning. If "the doctrine of the universal and absolute reign of God," as our author has stated and labored to maintain it, is true, then the following consequences seem to be unavoidable:

1. *That man is not a Person.* If man is such a being as our author represents him, a being who can neither think, of himself, nor stop thinking; who cannot make a volition or lift a finger, but in all he does, whether of mind or body, only acts as he is acted upon, a mere instrument of another's will, with what propriety of language is he called a person? In what respect can personality be predicated of him? He is a thing, not a person; a very wonderful machine, no doubt, but nothing more. To be a person implies something more than mere intelligence, or a consciousness of being. It demands an intelligent will, and a capacity for moral action; in other words, moral freedom. A machine, whether living or dead, can not be a person, neither can a mere animal.

2. It can require no argument to prove that a being who is governed in every thought and action by another, or by an imperious necessity; who is, as our author says, controlled in everything by an inviolable law; can in no proper sense of the term be considered *morally responsible.* His actions are not his own; they are performed through him, by means of

him as an instrument, and not by his own will. What we call his thoughts, purposes and actions, are to him as necessary and unavoidable as the movements of any piece of mechanism. It is a clear doctrine of our author that "the law of cause and effect obtains in the world of mind and motive as well as in the world of matter"; that "every choice or will of the human mind is the effect of some adequate cause"; and finally, that "the cause being present the effect inevitably follows." Man, therefore, has no more control of his volitions or of the actions that flow from them than a windmill has of its operations; and for aught we can see the mill is just as responsible as the man; and to affirm moral responsibility of either is simply absurd. Hence it follows,

3. That there is, and can be, no *moral wrong*, or *sin*, in the world. There is, in the first place, no moral law, and, in the second, no moral being who is subject to such a law. Sin has been defined by an apostle as the transgression of the law. But according to the doctrine of Divine Sovereignty, there is no law in the government of God which can be transgressed. All his laws are "inviolable." The laws under which man is placed can no more be violated than can the laws that govern the movement of the planets. But were there ten thousand moral laws here, man certainly is as incapable of transgressing them as he is of making a universe. He cannot even think, of himself. Everything within and without him is directed and regulated solely by the will of God, who "reigns in and over all beings"; so that always and everywhere the divine will is perfectly done, and the divine law obeyed. Every human feeling, thought and wish, every purpose and act, was determined from the first, and inwoven with the eternal chain of cause and consequence, so that it is as "impossible that it should be otherwise than it is," as that the earth should of its own accord stop in its career, or the sun of its own will withdraw its light. Hence, once more, it follows,

4. That there is *no moral government* in the world. The only kind of government the doctrine of Divine Sovereignty, or necessity, allows, is what we call the mechanical or physi-

cal. Its laws are absolutely inviolable, so far as its subjects are concerned. If a planet bends from its ordinary course, it is in obedience to law. So with men, under Dr. Williamson's divine government; let them do what they will, they cannot avoid doing it; there is "an invincible necessity" that urges them on; God has ordained their path and they cannot swerve a single line from it. Strangely enough, poor mortals dream of another, and, as they think, a higher form of government than this. They fancy they see a shadow of it in the State, where no law is inviolable, where rewards and punishments, praise and blame, honor and contempt, and a thousand influences from without and within are brought to bear upon the intellect and the conscience of man, to keep him in the path of social duty, but where, nevertheless, some, in spite of all laws and public opinion and self-respect, still trample the laws under foot and live and act as they will. A better example of moral government is often seen in the family, where also no laws are inviolable, where parents are engaged in the sublime work, not of perfecting machines, but of educating and training moral beings, free spirits, and where by patience and perseverance, by a wise love and a steady authority, the waywardnesses of youth are often, not always, overcome, and moral character, beautiful and strong, the chiefest glory of man and of the world, is gradually formed. But men are not wise enough nor good enough to frame laws or administer them so as to exhibit a perfect moral government, and hence it has been a dream of the wisest and best of all ages that above us such a government has been established, and that it is being administered in a manner according with the infinite perfections of God. As Bishop Butler says, "God exercises the same kind of government over us, with that which a father exercises over his children and a civil magistrate over his subjects." It is a marvel that in the scheme we are considering there is not a trace of moral government. Again, it follows,

5. That what we call *sin*, is not sin, properly speaking, but is in the sight of God needful, and right, and good. On this point our author is very clear, while his theory imperiously

demands such a conclusion. If, as Dr. Williamson insists, God "disposes and directs all things and all beings, and is himself the final and efficient cause of all the various phenomena in the universe," we need no argument to show that there is either no sin in the universe or God is the author of it. Now that there is sin, or "what we call sin," in the world, our author very fully and frankly confesses. Indeed, there is a great deal of it, for the Doctor tells us that "if sin were left out of the history of the world, there would not be much remaining." But this sin in the hand of God is good. It is necessary to the perfection of the divine work. It is, as he says, what the deep shadows and dark background are to a grand picture. He represents it as somehow a delicate and difficult thing to manage, and, therefore, he thinks "if aught evil must needs enter, it is better to come in under the auspices of God, who can and will say, 'Thus far shalt thou go and no farther,' and thus perform its definite mission and no more — than to come unbidden and unbounded, to work at random without design or restraint." He engages in an argument to prove that all this sin was "best upon the whole," that it was "needed," and, what required no proof on his theory, that all the sin there is in the world must be ascribed directly to God. To have made man morally free, he says, would not have relieved the Almighty; for "whoever voluntarily does an act, knowing the consequences, does thereby assume all the consequences of that act, whether they be good or bad." "To say that God permitted it, is no more than to play upon words."

On this whole subject our author is obviously laboring under difficulties. There seems to be, on one side, a kind of feeling, perhaps the remains of former prejudices, that sin is not precisely a good or beautiful thing, or altogether the thing that one would naturally expect God to produce, but, on the other, the power of his system overcomes these scruples after a struggle, and we learn that there are two sources of error in the world, one of which is "the admission that there are some things existing and some things done and performed

which would dishonor God, if the responsibility rested upon them"; and the other is "the idea that the introduction of an intermediate agent relieves him entirely of all responsibility in the premises"; while in fact "there is, in all truth, nothing in the universe, correctly understood, that can reflect anything else but honor and glory upon his holy name."

6. Another consequence of this theory is plainly the restoration of the almost forgotten doctrine, once so familiar in Calvinistic pulpits, of *two wills* in God, his revealed and his secret will. These wills unfortunately are not always harmonious, and are often directly and violently opposed to each other. "It is a grave error," the Doctor says, "to take every command of the law as an expression of the absolute will of God. . . . The law says, 'Thou shalt not kill.' Are we hence to conclude that God intended this law to prevent men from killing, and that his absolute will was that men should not kill? By no means. . . . The law of the commandment is not an announcement of the absolute will of God, which is to be done now and always. But it is the precept of the teacher, who would educate us in the knowledge of sin, and of things divine." This is a most convenient doctrine. It helps to explain a good many riddles that would otherwise be quite annoying. In his revealed will, for instance, God enjoins it upon men to speak the truth, to be honest, and just, etc., etc.; but by his secret will he provides that some of them shall be liars, dishonest, unjust, and the like. By his revealed will he commands men to love their neighbors, but in his secret will he resolves that some shall hate them. In his revealed will we are taught to love and honor God, but in his secret will he intends that many shall blaspheme the divine name, and lift their hands in rebellion against their Maker. And what is much to be regretted, God's secret will always has its way; while his revealed will, which to our poor understanding seems far the better one, very often goes under. With our author's profound reverence for the revelation God has given us, it is not easy to reconcile this shabby device for utterly emptying it of both authority and influence. When

God sets himself against his own word, we need not wonder at human unbelief.

7. We will suggest but one consequence more. It is that if we are not moral beings, under a moral government, that is, if we are not free and governed as such, then we can not conceive what morality is, nor can we even think that God himself is a moral Being. The Scriptures teach that man was made in the image of God; but how, in what sense, is the contemptible thing Dr. Williamson calls man, like his Creator? He resembles him no more than a go-cart resembles the mechanic that builds it. He can neither feel, nor think, nor reason, he can recognize no law of duty, he can determine on no action, he can form no character, he can indeed do nothing, of himself, and is that meanest of all imaginable things, "a creature of circumstances" — no better than thistle-down in the wind, carried, and lodged or lost, wherever an eternal necessity drives him. Be his fortune and fate what it may, he has neither part nor lot in it. He only thinks and acts as he is obliged to think and act. And we confess to no little pain at seeing a man with an intellect and a heart, and especially one of our friends, devoting his time and talents to prove, if he thereby proves anything, that curious as he may be as a machine, he is as a man no better than the table he writes on.

Could we get at the bottom of all this wretched twaddle about necessity and the eternal law of cause and consequence, we should find that Dr. Williamson cannot *conceive* how God could make a moral being, capable of self-action — the only action that has an element of morality in it. And therefore he denies the very existence of such a being. He goes farther; he would persuade us, — for this is the logical issue of his theory, — that God does his thinking; that God really made these Rudiments of Theological and Moral Science, and that he himself was only a kind of amanuensis! Indeed, if this theory is true, God is as really the author of this book as he is of the Bible; and there is not a contradiction, a falsehood, a meanness, a vice, or a crime in the world, which has

not been inspired by God, and may not be regarded as his work. Our author, as we have seen, not only denies that there is a created being in the universe capable of originating a single thought or motion, but also denies that God himself is able to create such a being. In his great zeal for the honor and glory of God, he sets bounds to his perfections and limits the Almighty. There is no free service in the universe. All the homage and adoration God can ever receive, he has to manufacture for himself. Think of all the worship tendered to him on earth, and that higher and purer service which angels and the spirits of the redeemed offer in heaven; and then reflect that, in the light of this boasted theology, all this is the sole product of God's own action through beings incapable of themselves of originating a thought or uttering a syllable, mere living, conscious automatons; and can we conceive a sadder farce, whether on the part of the creature or the Creator? Is this the kind of worship God requires? Is this the glad homage, the gratitude, the love, that are to reflect through eternity the glory of God, and constitute the felicity of his intelligent and moral creation? Poor as we are, we should pity a God who could do nothing better than this; who with his infinite perfections can not make even one being capable of spontaneous service, of personal gratitude, or filial love.

Now any theory that has to confront such consequences as these, that is surrounded by pitfalls from which no amount of learning or ingenuity can relieve it, may, as a matter of mere speculation, be worthy of a moment's thought, but as a practical matter it can deserve no consideration at all. It contradicts our primary convictions, and could it be generally adopted and acted upon, would overturn society and annihilate religion, or at least make it a worthless mummery.

Yet our author fancies that he has proofs almost demonstrative of the doctrine he advocates. Though drawn apparently from a wide field, they are easily grouped under three heads. They are all predicated on the attributes of God, the human consciousness, and the testimony of the Scriptures.

So far as the arguments from the divine perfections are concerned, they are all rendered invalid, — if perhaps we except that drawn from God's foreknowledge, — by the circumstance that they necessarily rest on the previous assumption that God cannot make a moral being. God is unquestionably infinite "in power, wisdom and goodness"; but how does that prove that he has produced no moral creation, or that he reigns supreme, in Dr. Williamson's mechanical sense, "over all worlds and all beings?" The question is properly, not what God can or can not do, in the abstract, but simply what he has done, what kind of universe he has created, and how he governs it and the creatures that are in it. If, as a matter of fact, he has actually made such a world as Dr. Williamson fancies, common sense would teach us, if we only had such a gift and the power of using it, that it is not worth our while to trouble ourselves any farther about it. The machine, of which we make an insignificant part, will run on in spite of us; and, according to the theory, we are obliged to trouble ourselves for that very reason. Dr. Williamson must needs write books, and we from the same necessity must review them, and show how inconsistent and absurd they are. And thus the useless play goes on.

As to the great argument from the divine foreknowledge, beyond question the most specious, if not the most formidable, at the command of the necessitarian, we would simply ask what any one knows of it to justify a denial of man's moral nature and consequently his moral freedom. Grant, if you please, that we cannot explain this divine perfection in harmony with what we know of ourselves and our duties, and must we therefore assume that we are not moral beings? If this were the only place in the whole realm of thought, where we come to the end of "our tether," and are obliged to confess our inability to fathom the depths by which we are surrounded, the case would be different. No one has more severely censured that "pride of intellect which is ashamed to confess a weakness," than our author, and very few have exhibited more numerous or glaring instances of it. So can-

did and careful a thinker as Dugald Stewart, speaking on this subject of foreknowledge, says, "I have hitherto taken no notice of those arguments which necessitarians have founded upon the *Prescience of the Deity*, because I do not think them fairly applicable to the subject; inasmuch as they draw an inference from what is *altogether beyond the reach of our faculties*, against a fact *for which every man has the evidence in his own consciousness*." Besides, what, let us ask, has the foreknowledge of God to do with us, as moral beings, or we with it? Does it absolve us from a single duty, or save us from a single consequence which violation of duty is sure to bring along with it? Are we the less obliged to be honest, truthful, benevolent, or religious, because God foreknows how we shall behave ourselves? Were Joseph's brethren the less guilty or less punished because God overruled their evil for good; or was the woe pronounced against Judas the lighter, or his repentance the less bitter, because it had been foretold that he was to betray his Master? As a matter of speculation, we repeat, this divine foreknowledge may have its interest and its difficulties, but as a practical matter it clearly has neither. But farther, does it not deserve Dr. Williamson's consideration, whether if, as he maintains, God can know the future only as it is made certain and inevitable, this foreknowledge does not as effectually exclude the divine, as it does human, liberty? Indeed, is not this the result to which the doctrine of necessity, in any form it may take, must ultimately come? It binds God himself as fast as it does man. He foreknows his own actions as well as ours; and we can no more conceive of his acting without a motive than we can ourselves; and motives, in our author's theory, are efficient causes, so that the cause being present the effect inevitably follows.

The argument from human consciousness is stated thus: "There is in man a distinct consciousness that the world of mind and matter is controlled and governed by a superior power. . . . He is as certain as he is of existence that there is no causeless volition. . . . If, therefore, we are

conscious that all our volitions and actions proceed from some cause, then full surely the reign of God in and over all our thoughts and acts is also a matter of consciousness." Now to say nothing of the looseness of this reasoning, must it not be confessed that this is a most remarkable way of ascertaining the verdict of our consciousness? We had before supposed that the testimony of consciousness is direct and not easily impeached. Dr. Williamson makes its evidence the result of an argument. It is as if a man complained of a violent toothache, not that he suffered any pain, but he had an imperfect tooth, and therefore concluded it must ache. With a sharp fit of toothache a person would hardly need a syllogism to convince him of the fact. So here, if mankind are conscious that they are slaves of necessity, and that God reigns in and over them in such a way that they can neither think nor act of themselves, that fact, we conceive, settles at once the whole controversy, and leaves nothing further to be said. Then the only question to be solved would be how this false and troublesome notion of liberty ever entered the mind and diffused itself over human life, moulding our judgments, affecting legislation and the administration of justice, and finally penetrating to the core our religion. But does Dr. Williamson fairly represent the voice of human consciousness on this subject? So far from it, we suppose there is not a healthy mind in the world that is conscious of any such slavery as this theory of necessity assumes. On the contrary, we are conscious of entire liberty in the whole domain of moral action. And what is worthy of observation, this is frankly confessed by the great majority of those who maintain or favor the doctrine of necessity. We would not be so uncivil as to say, with Lord Bolingbroke, that no one can deny that he has free-will, "without lying or denying his intuitive knowledge," but we certainly must say with Locke, "I cannot have a clearer perception of anything than that I am free"; and with the Abbe Galiani, that "the persuasion of liberty constitutes the essence of man. We may define man to be *an animal who believes himself free;* and this would be a

complete definition. It is absolutely impossible for man to forget for an instant, and to renounce the persuasion, that he is free."

Dr. Williamson imposes upon himself by habitually using the term *motive* in the sense of *cause*. Yet the two things represented by these words can hardly be said to resemble each other. A motive is a suggestion or incitement to an action; a cause involves the idea of necessity in producing its effect. A man has a motive for uttering a falsehood, or performing an act of benevolence; and yet he may resist it, or throw it aside and act in a contrary way; but fire applied to gunpowder necessarily produces an explosion, and a violent storm at sea may prove too strong for the power or skill of men, and be the cause of a shipwreck. John Stuart Mill says, "The application of the same term to those agencies on which human actions depend, as is used to express those agencies of nature which are really uncontrollable, cannot fail, when habitual, to create a feeling of uncontrollableness in the former also." Of the truth of this remark Dr. Williamson's book furnishes innumerable instances. The whole work is saturated with the mechanical philosophy. All his illustrations are drawn from the movement of the heavenly bodies, or from what is merely mathematical. To prove, for instance, that we have no freedom of choice, no control of our volitions, he gives us an example like this: Offer a poor man, greatly in need of money, the choice between an eagle and a cent, or between two eagles, one of which is spurious, and can there be any doubt which he will choose. Try the experiment a hundred times and the result will be the same. Therefore man has no freedom of choice! We wonder he had not taken his illustration from geometry or the multiplication table. Has it never occurred to our author that mathematical truths are necessary truths, and that it is impossible for us intelligently to think them different from what they are? A circle is not a square, and three times five do not make nineteen, say what we will about it. An eagle is worth a thousand times as much as a cent, and more than a thou-

sand times as much as a counterfeit coin that is worth nothing. Now to perceive this is a mere act of the judgment, and has nothing more to do with our moral nature than has the fact that the earth is ninety-five millions of miles from the sun. Suppose, instead of such questions, we ask a man suspected of crime if he is guilty? The simple point we wish to determine is whether he can tell the truth or tell a falsehood, or is he so conditioned by nature that he can do the one while the other is absolutely impossible. When a man is about to steal, is he conscious that he must steal, and that it is absolutely impossible for him to avoid it? And so of all our actions. Are they necessary? Dr. Williamson says they are. The world knows they are not.

The argument drawn from the Scriptures, is, if possible, still worse than that from human consciousness. To an unprejudiced reader it would seem that if the Bible teaches anything clearly, it is that man is a moral being, free, and therefore properly responsible for his conduct. It uniformly addresses him in this character. It regards him as capable of doing his duty, and also as liable to neglect it, and able to resist and transgress every moral law and obligation under which he is placed. It therefore appeals to his reason and conscience, to his sense of what is right and what is becoming; it unfolds his duty and urges him to perform it. It exhorts and warns him, it promises rewards and threatens punishments. And when he has made his choice and acted, the Bible represents the divine government as treating him precisely as he would deserve had his choice and action been his own. The Scriptures are, indeed, a history of God's dealings with men as moral beings. The Bible was written for a moral purpose. Take the moral element out of it, and its chief, if not its only, value is gone. It speaks to our conscience, and in the very language of our consciousness. Though we are made by God, and have the ground of our being in him, we know that we are neither God, nor mere instruments through which God is at every moment thinking and acting. Whether we can explain the fact or not, we

know that we are endowed with personality, possess moral freedom, and as such are proper subjects of moral government. And so the Bible teaches. It charges us with sin, and our own souls confess it. Is this all an illusion? Has God made our nature a lie, and then given us a revelation to confirm it? Does he first deceive us in the very centre of our being, and then practice upon us the injustice of punishing us for what he himself caused us to do? It is simply absurd. It is more — it is profane.

On this whole subject our author's reasoning is singularly confused and unsatisfactory. That there is such a thing as sin in the world he cannot deny, though he often consoles himself that it is not "a substance or an entity." But whether an entity or not, sin is here, and we all feel its power and suffer in consequence of it. How came it here? Who is its author? Dr. Williamson's theory maintains that it is God. But if God is its author, is it *sin?* What then do we mean by sin? What is it? These questions he seems never to have asked himself, or certainly has not answered in the book before us. In the case of Joseph's brethren, which he takes as a key to unlock all mysteries, he finds that they *meant* the sale of Joseph *for evil*, but God *meant* it *for good.* But what is the import of this? If God reigned in and over their thoughts and actions, how did he make them mean precisely the reverse of what he himself meant? They "*wickedly* sold their brother," the Doctor says. Yes; but how was this wickedness worked into them or into their thought and action when God was the author of both? This very passage of Scripture, which Dr. Williamson selects to resolve all moral problems, is itself the most conclusive proof of man's personality and moral freedom. It exhibits two agents or actors, God and men; two wills, the divine and human; and two aims or purposes, directly opposed to each other, one good, the other evil. So our author quotes, "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps," to prove his doctrine of the absolute control of man's every thought and action by God, while in fact it proves only that "Many are the devices

in a man's heart, but the counsel of the Lord, that shall stand"; or as Shakespeare expressed it, "There's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them as we will"; or as the French say, "Man proposes, but God disposes." Even our Saviour, though the Son of God, and one with his Father, still had his personal being and separate will, or he could never have said, "*Thy* will, not *mine*, be done"; and prayer itself, in which he often engaged, would have been a mockery. And while speaking on this point, we wish Dr. Williamson would attempt to interpret our Lord's Prayer in accordance with his scheme. What can we mean when we say, "Thy will be done on earth, as it is done in heaven"? Does not our author teach expressly that God's will is always and everywhere absolutely done? "Forgive us our trespasses." *Our* trespasses! Then *we* have done something, and something that needs forgiveness. But in our author's scheme there is properly no sin, and no place for either repentance or pardon. Indeed, he generally allows the exercise of no moral judgment. "Where, then, is praise, and where is blame?" he asks; and answers, "Precisely in the mind of vain man, who imagines himself to be something when he is nothing; and who thinks himself qualified to sit in judgment on himself and his fellow-men. It proceeds from our fancied knowledge of good and evil, and is not, therefore, even a normal condition of the human mind. It is the badge of the transgressor. It is gained by an attempt to project ourselves out of God, and to act on our own account, without him and in spite of him,—an effort in which we must always fail." We suppose this bitter denunciation of all who praise or blame themselves or their fellow-men, implies no blame on the part of those who are guilty of this outrage, nor on the part of the Doctor who thus censures them. It is all foreordained, and makes a necessary portion of that beautiful scheme of cause and consequence, in which all things and all beings are involved.

On this whole subject of sin, condemnation and retribution, these Rudiments are little better than one inextricable tan-

Yet there are many things here that deserve a mention their novelty. The origin of natural evil, as we call it, is ıd in the collision and conflict necessarily produced by Dr. liamson's "motion in all possible directions." As he says, ovements in different directions must cross each other in ıorts of angles, and activities that interlock must produce tact and conflict; and hence comes natural evil." Very ly! From this position our author proceeds to show that l that we call evil belongs to the same category, and the ıt problem of its existence must be solved upon the same ıciples. . . . If we can explain how it is that the ıtence of the lion, that rends a kid, or of the eagle, that ries off an infant, is consistent with the divine goodness, shall find no difficulty when we come to the case of a :od or a Caligula, a Pontius Pilate or a Judas." Let us be amazed at a declaration like this. It is a necessary ılt of our author's system. All is of God and all is good. v it happens that every one, not blinded by a theory, knows n his own consciousness that, as we are obliged by our ure to look at things, there is a world-wide difference ween natural and moral evil, between a lion and a Calig- . Suppose our author had a fruit-tree loaded with grow- fruit. Would it be perfectly indifferent to his feelings l moral judgment whether it was destroyed by a hail-storm beaten down by a malicious neighbor? We all know it ıld not. This wretched philosophy would persuade us that rder, that is, killing with malice prepense, is an act of pre- ıly the same character, morally, as killing by the merest ident. Of such moral science we do not think the world nds in any special need.

ıet us not, however, do Dr. Williamson the injustice of rep- enting him as always in harmony with his system, or even h himself. He is perpetually forgetting his theory and ing back into the realm of common morality and common se. "Nobody," says John Stuart Mill, "is a consistent ılist"; and our author is no exception to the remark. d it is an encouraging circumstance that as he gets on in

in a man's heart, but the counsel of the Lord, that shall stand"; or as Shakespeare expressed it, "There's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them as we will"; or as the French say, "Man proposes, but God disposes." Even our Saviour, though the Son of God, and one with his Father, still had his personal being and separate will, or he could never have said, "*Thy* will, not *mine*, be done"; and prayer itself, in which he often engaged, would have been a mockery. And while speaking on this point, we wish Dr. Williamson would attempt to interpret our Lord's Prayer in accordance with his scheme. What can we mean when we say, "Thy will be done on earth, as it is done in heaven"? Does not our author teach expressly that God's will is always and everywhere absolutely done? "Forgive us our trespasses." *Our* trespasses! Then *we* have done something, and something that needs forgiveness. But in our author's scheme there is properly no sin, and no place for either repentance or pardon. Indeed, he generally allows the exercise of no moral judgment. "Where, then, is praise, and where is blame?" he asks; and answers, "Precisely in the mind of vain man, who imagines himself to be something when he is nothing; and who thinks himself qualified to sit in judgment on himself and his fellow-men. It proceeds from our fancied knowledge of good and evil, and is not, therefore, even a normal condition of the human mind. It is the badge of the transgressor. It is gained by an attempt to project ourselves out of God, and to act on our own account, without him and in spite of him, — an effort in which we must always fail." We suppose this bitter denunciation of all who praise or blame themselves or their fellow-men, implies no blame on the part of those who are guilty of this outrage, nor on the part of the Doctor who thus censures them. It is all foreordained, and makes a necessary portion of that beautiful scheme of cause and consequence, in which all things and all beings are involved.

On this whole subject of sin, condemnation and retribution, these Rudiments are little better than one inextric

in a man's heart, but the counsel of the Lord, that shall stand"; or as Shakespeare expressed it, "There's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them as we will"; or as the French say, "Man proposes, but God disposes." Even our Saviour, though the Son of God, and one with his Father, still had his personal being and separate will, or he could never have said, "*Thy* will, not *mine*, be done"; and prayer itself, in which he often engaged, would have been a mockery. And while speaking on this point, we wish Dr. Williamson would attempt to interpret our Lord's Prayer in accordance with his scheme. What can we mean when we say, "Thy will be done on earth, as it is done in heaven"? Does not our author teach expressly that God's will is always and everywhere absolutely done? "Forgive us our trespasses." *Our* trespasses! Then *we* have done something, and something that needs forgiveness. But in our author's scheme there is properly no sin, and no place for either repentance or pardon. Indeed, he generally allows the exercise of no moral judgment. "Where, then, is praise, and where is blame?" he asks; and answers, "Precisely in the mind of vain man, who imagines himself to be something when he is nothing; and who thinks himself qualified to sit in judgment on himself and his fellow-men. It proceeds from our fancied knowledge of good and evil, and is not, therefore, even a normal condition of the human mind. It is the badge of the transgressor. It is gained by an attempt to project ourselves out of God, and to act on our own account, without him and in spite of him,—an effort in which we must always fail." We suppose this bitter denunciation of all who praise or blame themselves or their fellow-men, implies no blame on the part of those who are guilty of this outrage, nor on the part of the Doctor who thus censures them. It is all foreordained, and makes a necessary portion of that beautiful scheme of cause and consequence, in which all things and all beings are involved.

On this whole subject of sin, condemnation and retribution, these Rudiments are little better than one inextricable tan-

gle. Yet there are many things here that deserve a mention for their novelty. The origin of natural evil, as we call it, is found in the collision and conflict necessarily produced by Dr. Williamson's "motion in all possible directions." As he says, "Movements in different directions must cross each other in all sorts of angles, and activities that interlock must produce contact and conflict; and hence comes natural evil." Very likely! From this position our author proceeds to show that "all that we call evil belongs to the same category, and the great problem of its existence must be solved upon the same principles. . . . If we can explain how it is that the existence of the lion, that rends a kid, or of the eagle, that carries off an infant, is consistent with the divine goodness, we shall find no difficulty when we come to the case of a Herod or a Caligula, a Pontius Pilate or a Judas." Let us not be amazed at a declaration like this. It is a necessary result of our author's system. All is of God and all is good. Now it happens that every one, not blinded by a theory, knows from his own consciousness that, as we are obliged by our nature to look at things, there is a world-wide difference between natural and moral evil, between a lion and a Caligula. Suppose our author had a fruit-tree loaded with growing fruit. Would it be perfectly indifferent to his feelings and moral judgment whether it was destroyed by a hail-storm or beaten down by a malicious neighbor? We all know it would not. This wretched philosophy would persuade us that murder, that is, killing with malice prepense, is an act of precisely the same character, morally, as killing by the merest accident. Of such moral science we do not think the world stands in any special need.

Let us not, however, do Dr. Williamson the injustice of representing him as always in harmony with his system, or even with himself. He is perpetually forgetting his theory and falling back into the realm of common morality and common sense. "Nobody," says John Stuart Mill, "is a consistent fatalist"; and our author is no exception to the remark. And it is an encouraging circumstance that as he gets on in

his work, he seems to become more and more rational, and had he made his volume twice as large as it is, we think he would have completely refuted at the close the whole system with which he started at the beginning. As it is, after having traced all sins back directly to God, he finally charges them as positively on man, and sharply admonishes us that we are not to "sit in judgment upon the Creator." He talks of reason and conscience, of a moral world and moral judgment, of penitence and reformation, as if such things existed, and quite forgetful, it seems, that they have no place in his theory of the universe. He speaks of moral responsibility and retributions, and advises men to "take care that they do not pull down upon their heads the arm of the law and the sword of its vengeance." He tells us how sinners suffer, how their own consciences reproach them and charge them with being fools and making themselves lower than the brutes by their vices and crimes. He has discovered the great law of Christian love, and assures us that there is no sin but in the violation of this royal law. He who loves God supremely, and his neighbor as himself, fulfills the whole law. Here, he says, is the basis of moral obligation. "Let him who would teach moral philosophy take his stand upon this great law of love; let him show its application to the family, husbands and wives, parents and children, brothers and sisters, masters and servants, neighbors and friends," etc., etc. This is common sense, and the gospel too; but what possible relation has it to the scheme of necessity? Must not the machine run on as it was started?

To the natural objection, on his theory, that it is not man's fault if he does not fulfill the law of love, Dr. Williamson replies, "Begging pardon, we insist that it is man's fault, and his alone. His fault is that he is the slave of sin. . . . The fault lies deeper than his outward actions. It is in his heart of hearts. But who made the heart? No matter who made the heart. The question is not as to its origin, but its character. . . . Do we not thus shift the blame upon God? So the pride of human wisdom would do." Again,

speaking of the sinner, conscience-stricken and penitent, our author says, "He has no need of the doctrine of free agency to form the basis of moral judgment. He thinks more of what he is than of what he has done. If he is so beset with hatred that he cannot fulfill the law, the more does he grieve and the more strive to open his soul that he may receive the inflowings of the divine love, that he may be better and stronger." Let us be thankful. A little while ago man was as helpless as clay in the hand of the potter. He could neither think nor act of himself.

The piety which appears in this volume — and there is no inconsiderable degree of it — is, as might be expected, of a somewhat uncommon character. It is eminently that of self-abnegation. If there is anything which our author dreads and deems it needful to condemn, it is that man should "think himself to be something, while he is nothing," and so detract from the glory of God. He often censures the pride of philosophy and of wisdom, and says, "This is the sin of the world. Pride goeth before every fall. Our sin is the same as that of our first parents, namely, we seek to be as God, and assume to be automatic, able to be and do of ourselves." He often exhorts to humility, and that we should believe and feel that we can do nothing of ourselves, and that all is of God. "This man has sinned. He has thought himself like unto God. He has imagined that he is something independent of God, and so arrayed himself against the Most High. . . . His pride of self and his confidence in his own strength need to be humbled and broken." It is a remark of Dugald Stewart, that "among the various forms which religious enthusiasm assumes, there is a certain prostration of the mind, which, under the specious guise of a deep humility, aims at exalting the Divine perfections by annihilating the powers that belong to human nature."

Of the influences of such a theory as we have now been considering, it is hardly necessary to speak. The work before us is radical and revolutionary. It practically denies all the most common and settled convictions of the world. It

demands a new philosophy and a new religion. We need, in fact, a new nomenclature, since our language, as it now exists, is utterly unsuitable to express the doctrines of our author. Words must be accommodated to new meanings, and a new order of thoughts and feelings should be established. Our author himself has experienced these inconveniences. Sometimes he has modified the meaning of terms to express his ideas; sometimes he has quite reversed their signification, as established by use, and in many instances he has suggested new terms better fitted to represent his views. He came near abolishing the familiar word *love*, and substituting the more philosophical term *attraction*. That he will find readers who will admire and adopt his philosophy, and regard his crude and contradictory speculations as the height of wisdom, is not to be doubted; but it is to be hoped that the number of such persons is not large, and it is very certain that they will not be made more religious or more virtuous by such discipleship. So far as such a theory can be believed and made a ground of moral action, its influence cannot fail to be mischievous. We regret to have such a work go out into the community, as the ripest thought of one of our oldest and most influential ministers. It is as little in harmony with the spirit of the age as it is with truth itself. It does not at all represent the sense of the better and more thoughtful part of our own church; while its dogmatism, its disputatious spirit, its frequent and glaring contradictions, and above all, its doctrines, so fitted to shock every reverent and pious feeling, cannot fail to impress most unfavorably all those without our own body into whose hands it may chance to fall. We can hardly conceive how Universalism could be presented in a more repulsive form; and yet the reader is perpetually reminded that this is the only garb in which our distinguishing doctrine is defensible, and that we have only the election between this monstrous theory and blank atheism! God grant that this may be the last exhibition we are doomed to see of this kind of "theological and moral science."

ARTICLE VIII.

Biographical Sketches.

II. EDWARD TURNER.

THE name of EDWARD TURNER is one of the most conspicuous in our early history. The late Dr. Ballou once spoke of him as "for a long period one of the most distinguished ornaments of our ministry."[1] He was not only the associate and friend, but, considered in his wholeness, the acknowledged peer of HOSEA BALLOU. Very unlike, but drawn together by those subtile and inexplicable attractions which so often bind persons of the most opposite qualities into the closest intimacy, these two men were for years (in a high sense) the *par nobile fratrum*, — the David and Jonathan of our forming Church: one in counsel, one in much of their labor, one in the hearts of the people. But (as all Universalists will think) in an unfortunate day for Mr. Turner, he saw it to be his duty, as he believed, to separate himself from the Church which he had so efficiently helped to found and build; and leaving us — to pass into an obscurity in his new relations which his ability and previous eminence should have made impossible — he has gradually faded out of our denominational memory. So far as the Universalists of to-day are concerned, outside the few who occasionally look into our primitive records, there is little acquaintance even with his name, and no appreciation of what he was, or did, or of our obligations to him. Nor is this all, nor the worst. His separation from us was the result of differences which have gone into our history, written and traditional, on the representations of those not in sympathy with him. On this account, so far as any impression of him does remain, it is, doubtless, for the most part unfavorable — an impression that he was quite another than the gentle, noble, unselfish, unambitious man he really was. It is time, therefore, that his memory should be

[1] *Universalist Quarterly*, Vol. v. p. 374.

revived and his true record exhibited. That record remains, no more to his praise than to our credit, though he did leave us. Something of it is here presented. So far as I know, not even the briefest sketch of his life or work has ever before appeared in any of our publications; and having not only known, but loved and venerated him as one of my early pastors, I have found it a sacred pleasure to revive my recollections of him, and — though at the cost of much time and labor — to gather the materials accessible concerning him, that, for the honor of our Church and in justice to him, his actual place in our galaxy of pioneers may henceforth be better understood.[2]

EDWARD TURNER was born in Medfield, Mass., July 28, 1776. His father was Seth Turner,[3] who is described as a quiet, honest, benevolent man, a farmer, very fond of books. Edward was sent to the school of the celebrated Hannah Adams and her sister, where he was taught his letters; and in later years he frequently spoke of the Adams family as kindly neighbors, the use of whose books was freely granted to his father and himself. In 1786, his family removed to Sturbridge, Mass. Here the bookish tastes of the father no doubt helped to determine those of the son, so that we find him, in his seventeenth year, at Leceister Academy. Precisely how long he was a student there, it is impossible to ascertain. It is equally

[2] Grateful acknowledgements are here made to his daughters, Mrs. Amy T. Brown, of West Roxbury, and Mrs. Martha D. Brewer, of Jamaica Plain, for much of the information here embodied, as well as for the use of MSS. and personal records. Acknowledgements are also tendered to Hon. Charles Hudson, Holmes Ammidown, Esq., of New York, and Revs. R. Streeter, L. Willis, R. Eddy, and G. W. Bicknell. *Special* thanks are tendered to Mrs. Brown and Messrs. Hudson and Willis. It is a matter of great regret that the personal records left by Mr. Turner are so few and fragmentary.

[3] The genealogy of the family is traced back three generations from Seth, to John, of Medfield, who was "made a freeman May 2, 1648." Mr. Ammidown writes me, "It is thought by the family, according to the impression of their father, that he (Edward) was a lineal descendant of John Turner who came over in the *Mayflower*, in 1620. But according to Gov. Bradford's history, *Mass. His. Soc'y*, p. 454, 'John Turner and his two sons died in the first sickness, but he hath a daughter still living at Salem, well married.' If this is correct, Edward Turner could not have been a descendant of John Turner, of *Mayflower* notoriety."

impossible to say when, where, or how, he first became interested in Universalism. He was educated under "orthodox" influence, and used to say that he "held the minister in such fearful reverence that he would jump over the wall to hide himself if he saw that he must meet him on the road." But the towns in the section of Worcester County in which he lived were among those where Universalism was first preached. Oxford especially was one of its strongholds, — the first Convention having met there when he was ten years old. In such a neighborhood, he could not have lived long without hearing something of the "strange doctrine"; but all that is known is that he is said to have been a Universalist as early as his sixteenth or seventeenth year. In a paper on "Changes in the Religious Views of Universalists," he says, "We can speak of the change in their mode of preaching from memory only. It was not till the year 1795 that we noticed any change at all":[4] which implies that, so early as the date given, he had been for some time accustomed to hear Universalist preaching. Dr. Ballou, moreover, tells us that, having heard Father Ballou preach the sermon to which reference is made in the above date, Mr. Turner "conversed with him after service on the novel ground which he had maintained in his discourse":[5] which not only indicates that he was already a well-informed and thoughtful Universalist, fully identified with our friends, but that he was on such terms with Mr. Ballou as to warrant a free conversation with him concerning his sermons.[6] He was then only nineteen years old. But though so young, he had been a year married, and was a father. He was married in 1794, to Miss Amy Pike, of Sturbridge. He did not begin to preach, however, until 1798, when, being twenty-two years of age, he preached his first sermon at Bennington, Vt.[7] How he was employed up to this date, there is

[4] *Universalist Quarterly*, Vol. vi., p. 14. [5] *Quarterly*, Vol. v., p. 374.

[6] Dr. Whittemore dates "the friendship, confidence and fellowship of Mr. Turner" with Father Ballou a year before this, — 1794. *Life of Ballou*, Vol. i., p. 397.

[7] This statement is based on the impression of his eldest daughter, Mrs. Mary Weld, of South Hadley Falls, Mass., and is confirmed as to the year by a letter of his now before me, written in 1828, just after his withdrawal, in which he speaks of "the associations formed in" his "early professional life" as having "been continued during thirty years."

nothing to inform us. It is probable, however, that at least a portion of his time was spent in teaching.[8]

He first appears in our annals in 1800, when it is recorded that a Letter of License was given him by the General Convention. The record also says that, on the first day of the session, Sept. 17, "Bro. E. Turner preached an excellent discourse from Ps. lxxii. 16." It is recorded further that, on the afternoon of the same day, the Convention voted that "the well-beloved Hosea Ballou, Zephaniah Lathe and Caleb Rich, ministers of the Gospel of peace, do attend to the ordination of the approved brother Edward Turner at such time and place as the Society, Council and Candidate may appoint."[9] He was also associated with Hosea Ballou and Ebenezer Paine "to examine the credentials of applicants for ordination, and to ordain, if so requested, in the recess of the Convention." And still further, at the same session, he was made one of a Committee, Messrs. Ballou and Paine being his associates, "instructed to repair to New Marlboro', Mass., and faithfully to examine the complaints of the society in that place against a brother in the ministry, and if he is found faulty to deal with him in the spirit and power of discipline, to exhort, reprove, or rebuke, and if need be, to deny him the fellowship of this Convention."[10] All this indicates that not only was he already "an excellent" preacher, well established in the confidence of his brethren, but that, though so young, his character and maturity of judgment were deemed sufficient to warrant them in entrusting him with the gravest duties.[11] Let it be summarily added that from this time till

[8] His daughter (Mrs. Brown) says, "I have heard him talk of schools he had kept in his youth, but am not able to give time nor place." His eldest daughter (Mrs. Weld) says, "The year preceding his ministry was spent in study and working on the farm."

[9] When, or where, his ordination occurred, there is nothing to show. It appears, however, from the sermon of Rev. George Richards, at the dedication of the church in Salem, that he preached the Ordination Sermon, to a large concourse of people. *Semi-Centennial Pamphlet* of the Salem Church.

[10] *Manuscript Records of the General Convention.*

[11] The impression he, at this time, made upon his elder brethren is indicated by a letter of Murray, dated Feb. 23, 1801, soliciting his acquaintance. He says:

"Our brother Richards, who some time since attended the Convention, was kind enough to indulge me with some account of the proceedings of that body, and of the

1824, his name appears in the records nearly every year, and that he was seldom without some important appointment, telling of the appreciation accorded him.[12]

At the time of his first appearance at the Convention, his home was still at Sturbridge; and he continued to reside here, at the old homestead, until his second marriage, when he went to Charlton, where his letter accepting the call to Salem was dated. He is mentioned in the records of the Convention for 1803, as of Sturbridge and also of Charlton, from which it might be inferred that both these towns had societies, of which he was the pastor. But like those of all our early preachers, his labors were largely itinerant, so that we find him preaching in Bennington, Vt., Southbridge, Brookfield, Oxford, Dudley, Milford, Boston, Gloucester, and numerous other places.[13] The records of our Gloucester par-

principal characters that composed it, in which he made honorable mention of you. For some time past, I have been laboring to gain your address. I have at length succeeded, I hope. . . . I have therefore taken my pen this morning for the purpose of addressing a line to you as to a brother and fellow-laborer in the work of the ministry of the New Testament, humbly requesting you, if possible, to indulge me with *a visit*. I promise on my part to make it as agreeable to you as I am able. I want you to be *acquainted* with me, and encourage the hope that, when you are, you will not dislike me. I want a personal acquaintance with *you*, which is not necessary to gain my esteem and affection. You are already in possession of both."

[12] In 1801, reäppointed on Committee on Ordination, and made one of a Committee on Discipline. 1803, "Assistant Reader," or Clerk. 1804, Clerk. 1807—10—11—16, Assistant Clerk. 1816—24, Standing Clerk. 1817—19—24, Moderator. During all this time, too, he appears almost every year as one of the preachers.

[13] His daughter (Mrs. Weld) says "he was not pastor at Sturbridge at all, but itinerated all the time until he went to Salem." During all this period of itineracy, however, he seems to have been regarded as *the* young man of special promise, and was sought after accordingly. Letters to him from Murray and Richards, then our church leaders, are before me, all indicating this fact. The former writes, Oct. 9, 1802:

"You are here, I do assure you, much beloved and admired, and I am glad of it. You are coming on; I am going off the stage. . . . You will be, I humbly trust a burning and a shining light in God's temple."

And in December, of the same year, he writes again:

"I cannot help thinking, for the little while I have to remain, it would be more for the interest of the common cause if you and I were so to divide our labors as to keep this place [*i. e.* the church in Boston] always open, as the capital where, from all parts, they collect, and alternately supply as many other places as we could. . . . I look to the Bishop of our souls to ordain you for this purpose."

In July, 1802, Mr. Richards writes, pleading with him in behalf of Gloucester;—April 2, 1804, "I have assurances from Boston that you will be called as co-pastor with Mr. M. [urray], if they can effect it, and in case of his demise that you will be translated to that ready golden candlestick"; July 19, 1805, "I am told by my son that Foster's society in New York are heartily tired of him, and that they wish to fix you in his place. Thus you possess a kind of ubiquity, and all the churches are

ish show that it was voted to open a correspondence with him in 1803, touching the terms on which he would settle there.[14] On the 8th of May, 1807, a great sorrow came to him in the death of his wife, so early chosen, leaving him with four little motherless children, and in 1808 he wisely married again, to find in his companion, Miss Lucy Davis, of Charlton, a loving mother for his children, a wise counsellor and a devoted and sympathizing helper in every good work, whose praise is in all the churches with which she was connected, and whose memory is still fondly cherished in many hearts.[15] In 1809, he removed to Salem, Mass., though he appears to have had considerable previous acquaintance with the people and to have ministered to them some time before.[16] His acceptance

panting for the improvement of your gifts"; Nov. 18, 1806, informing him of his own call to Philadelphia, "I have besought them to turn their attention to you, in case they should be disappointed of me, . . . saying that you possess those gifts and graces in a superabounding degree which must insure the respect, affection and love of all the churches, . . . and that a capital is the place where" your "abilities ought to shine." Other extracts might be given to the same effect; but lack of space forbids.

[14] The record is dated March 12, 1803, and says that the society voted to "have Mr. Turner preach with them the current year," and that a Committee was appointed to confer with him and report at a subsequent meeting. But no such meeting appears to have been held.

[15] Four children were born of his first marriage, viz., Mary, Experience, Cassandana and Edward, of whom Mary (Mrs. Weld, before mentioned) alone survives. Of the second marriage, also, four children were born, viz., Amy (wife of Benj. Brown, Esq., West Roxbury), Martha Davis (wife of Capt. Charles Brewer, Jamaica Plain), Lucy Ann and Charles Henry, of whom only Mrs. Brown and Mrs. Brewer are now living. Their mother, it will interest many who knew her to be informed, survived her husband several years, departing Jan. 17, 1864, at the advanced age of eighty-five, in the full possession of all her faculties. "Her death," says her daughter (Mrs. Brown), "seemed as beautiful as it was natural. There was no sickness, no mental decay, no pain, no struggle. The vital machinery had worn out, and she laid down and went to sleep as quietly as an infant."

[16] According to the *Semi-Centennial Pamphlet* of this church, he seems to have had two "calls" here immediately previous to his removal; one, Jan. 9th, "at a meeting of the brethren," — the other, March 27th, by "the Proprietors." But from letters in my hands, it is clear that he had for years been a favorite, and that he had once arranged to make a protracted "visit" here. In a letter, dated July 19, 1805, Mr. Richards says, "By a letter from Bro. Murray, I find that you are called to Salem." Again, May 4, 1807, referring to Mrs. Turner's feeble condition, he expresses the hope "that the salubrious airs of spring, accompanied by a blessing on the Salem faculty, and the pure air of a sea-region, together with the journey, may operate greatly in her favor"; says that he thinks "the arrangement which the Salemites have made, generous for a young people"; approves his "choice of a house ready furnished";

is dated April 24, and he probably commenced his labors on the second Sunday in May, preaching in a hall until the church edifice was dedicated, and he was installed,[17] June 22, 1809. Here he remained till June, 1814, when he accepted a call to Charlestown, Mass. During his residence here, the controversy as to "future punishment" became hotly waged, and as the result of the feeling thus engendered in his congregation, his relations as pastor of the society were, at length, abruptly closed by a vote of dismissal, carried by a small majority. He preached his closing sermon Oct. 6, 1823. An immediate division of the congregation ensued, a portion of the members withdrawing, and inducing Mr. Turner to hold services in the Town Hall. These continued about six months, when, in March, 1824, he accepted an invitation to Portsmouth, N. H. He continued here till the spring of 1828, when, evidently not without much deliberation,[18] he

and adds, "I am glad that this expected visit to Salem draws you near to me." In four days after the date of this letter, Mrs. Turner died. Still, he seems to have made a brief visit, for, writing Aug. 17th following, Mr. Richards refers to a "farewell letter from Salem," and says, "You assure [me] that Salem offers many encouragements, but that as yet you have given the people no positive answer." Then, the *Circular Letter* of the Convention for 1808 says, "Salem . . . is preparing the way of the Lord, and our beloved brother Turner is saluted thence with the Macedonian cry, 'Come over and help us.' For four years at least, then, he was more or less in Salem, and the people were seeking to secure him as pastor. Why he so delayed acceptance, there is now nothing to show. Mrs. Turner was in a condition of great debility for years before her death, and this, possibly, may have rendered a removal inexpedient. There are other considerations, too, which *may* have induced his delay; for, writing under date of Aug. 17, 1807, Mr. Richards says:

"On this subject [removal to Salem] my advice [is] that, as it is generally supposed that Bro. John's [Murray's] days are drawing to a close, and as I feel persuaded that the Bostonians will have their eyes directed towards you, I think it may be prudent not to fix yourself immovably at Salem. It is true that Brother M. intends to introduce Mitchell, of New York, and if possible, to have him settled previous to his departure from this world. But I am certain that his congregation will act for themselves in case of such an event; and that they would prefer you to Mitchell, is my serious, solemn opinion. And as every man has a right to accept the best offer of two, I think it might be wise to wait events in Providence for a time, and to do nothing absolutely binding, in a moment."

[17] The venerable Rev. R. Streeter says, in a letter to the *Gospel Banner*, copied into the *Star in the West*, Nov. 12, 1870, that this installation of Mr. Turner was "the *first* installing service by which an ordained preacher took charge of a society" in our church history. But Rev. R. Eddy, in a note to the *Star*, Dec. 10, 1870, claims this distinction for the installation of Rev. T. Jones, at Gloucester.

[18] The invitation was given early in November, 1827. Immediately (Nov. 13th) he wrote to the wardens of his parish, asking their advice as to his leaving. On the 27th, he wrote to Rev. L. Willis: "You may have heard that I have been invited to settle

accepted an invitation to become pastor of the Unitarian Society in Charlton, his old home, where he was installed June 18th, and thus separated from us. He doubtless took this step anticipating that it would be his last removal. But he was disappointed, and in May, 1831, the pastorate was abruptly closed.[19] The winter of 1831–2 he spent at the South; and in July, 1832, he became minister of a small Unitarian Society at Fishkill Landing, N. Y.[20] Here he continued until the spring of 1840, when his family went to Charlestown, Mass., to reside for a year with his son-in-law, Mr. Brown, then of that place. In March, 1841, he and Mrs. Turner removed to Jamaica Plain, to a home left by their son-in-law, Capt. Brewer, in their care during his absence with his wife at the Sandwich Islands; and in this family they happily passed the remainder of their days.

After leaving Fishkill, Mr. Turner preached nearly every Sabbath, up to within two or three years of his death, spending considerable lengths of time by way of "supply" at Burlington, Vt., North Easton, Westminster, Boylston, Barnsta-

over a Unitarian society in Charlton, Mass. This is actually the case, and I wish your opinion on the subject. The society is probably to a man on the restoration ground. It is, in part, formed of persons who were my hearers and supporters in the early part of my ministry. I should be the same man I have ever been, and preach the same doctrine." His decision, probably, was not finally reached till January or February.

[19] A fund was somehow a source of revenue for his support; and while "the proprietors of the house" seem to have been favorable to him, many of "the subscribers to the fund" appear to have been, for some reason, dissatisfied. A good deal of feeling evidently existed, and the vote of dismissal was "that Mr. Turner's salary shall be paid to the 1st of November next, leaving it optional with him to preach, or not, after the 1st of May." This was, doubtless, one of the great troubles of Mr. T.'s life. He says in a letter before me, "The proceedings of a majority of the society wound my feelings. I may have deserved this, but certainly not at *their* hands."

[20] In a letter before me, dated Fishkill Landing, Oct. 12, 1832, he says, "In December last, I went to Augusta, Geo., where I continued till the latter part of March, when I went to Charleston, S. C., and preached a month on exchange with Mr. Gilman, who went to Augusta. I then came by water to New York, and supplied Mr. Lunt's pulpit [Second Unitarian, now Rev. Mr. Hepworth's], four Sabbaths while he was on a journey. I reached Charlton June 2d, and having been invited while at New York to officiate in the society at Fishkill during the year, I came here to commence my services on the first Sunday in July. . . . While I was in New York last spring, I preached an evening lecture in the Universalist Society, of which Mr. Sawyer is minister, and by his special request, I preached likewise to the society in Brooklyn where Mr. Hilyer officiates."

ble, and South Natick, Mass.; and he occasionally preached up to the last. He was present as one of the bearers, at the funeral of his old friend and co-worker, Mr. Ballou, June 9, 1852. In October of this year, he preached for the last time, in the Unitarian Church at West Roxbury. No decline in his health had been observed, except as the years always tell; and amidst his children and his books, with his faithful companion at his side, surrounded with everything to minister to his happiness, his days were passing in a serene, beautiful and (for him) vigorous old age, when suddenly, on Friday, Jan. 14, 1853, while reading, he was attacked with chills and the usual symptoms of a severe cold. Calling him to dinner, the servant found him too ill to go to the table. He immediately took his bed, and was comfortably sick for about a week. Then, on Thursday, after midnight, the severe distress of pleurisy set in, and he soon became very feeble. He said little, but, some time during Friday night, asked his daughter (Mrs. Brewer) what the physician thought of his case; and on being told that he thought him quite sick, but had expressed no fears, he declared his own conviction that he should not recover. During the same day (Friday) he had said to another daughter (Mrs. Brown), laying his hand on his side, "It is the old trouble; I have never been sound since that attack years ago." He now sank rapidly. But his mind remained clear, though, once or twice, he seemed to wander a moment, and early on Monday morning, Jan. 24, he peacefully passed to his rest, at the age of seventy-six years and six months.

Such are the outlines of Mr. Turner's life, so far as it has been possible to obtain them. It is safe to say that few will read them without feeling that the latter part of his public career was in no degree a fitting sequel to the prominence and promise of its beginning and early meridian. But however much a disappointment in this respect, no one can get at all into contact with its substance without feeling that the life thus outlined was the life of a thoroughly good man. As I

recall him, this comes to me as the thought certain, first of all, to occur to one meeting him. He had a face of apostolic sweetness and benignity,[21] and his whole air and presence were in harmony with it. He was fully six feet in stature, spare, light-complexioned, with hair thin and grey ever after I knew him, and giving evident indications of a lack of physical stamina. In the pulpit he presented a fine figure, erect and dignified, compromised possibly by a little loll. But in walking he had a kind of roll, with a slight stoop, and with just a suggestion of weakness at the knees, which, while detracting little from the dignity of his bearing, took from him what would otherwise have been the firmness and elasticity of his tread. Were I required, indeed, to give the best possible idea of his general appearance, physically, I should say that, while it had in it nothing in the slightest degree awkward, or ungainly, it reminded one of a tall lad who has grown too rapidly, and whose gait and movements reveal the absence of the needed muscular development. This was the consequence of a severe illness, about 1809 or 1811. Previous to this, he is said to have been erect, robust, firm of step, weighing between two hundred and three hundred pounds. But recovering, he left his chamber another man, and ever after had the appearance described.

And this change in him physically seems to have been the outward expression of a corresponding change in him in other particulars. Before this sickness, like his friend Mr. Ballou, he had been exclusively an extemporaneous preacher, and is said to have been one of the "rousing" sort, live, vehement, electric.[22] But from this period his whole manner changed,

[21] There are three portraits of him: one in the possession of Mrs. Weld, taken while he was at Charlestown, when he was between forty and fifty; one in the possession of Mrs. Brewer, taken when he was about fifty; and one in the possession of Mrs. Brown, taken when he was between sixty and seventy. Mrs. Brown says, "*I* think mine the best, though others might see differently." Is it too much to hope that, at some time, we may have a picture of him from one of these?

[22] I find the following comment upon his preaching, and also upon that of Father Ballou, in a letter to Mr. Turner from Rev. G. Richards, dated Nov. 5, 1810. He says: "The secondary sermon [at Convention] delivered by yourself, I have no manner of doubt gave great satisfaction, as on this text I am certain that your *moon* shone in the splendors of the sun, and that the Sun of Righteousness appeared seven times more

and his ordinary preaching became subdued, languid, what is called "moderate," — at times, perhaps, even heavy. I have no personal recollections of his *preaching*, except such as a boy from eight to twelve years old might take along; but the memories I thus have are of a man of saintly visage, whom I loved to look at in the pulpit, but whose sermonizing always seemed to me dull. And the impression thus lingering with me is confirmed by an examination of the MSS. in my hands, among which are many of the sermons to which I listened, judging from their dates. Here and there, reading them, a terse and telling apothegm strikes us. Now and then, we come upon a sentence, or a series of sentences, pointedly and forcibly, perhaps eloquently, put. But for the most part, there is nothing stout, brilliant, or stirring. It is good, healthy, common-place thought, usually clearly arranged and smoothly expressed, though stated often with a good deal of formality, and sometimes with needless circumlocution.[23] And comparing authorities, we find them all agreeing that, during the latter part of his ministry, though always sound and instructive, he was, as the rule, a plodding and sometimes prosy talker, rather than the muscular and stirring preacher he was at the outset. Judging from his MSS., he did not relinquish preaching extemporaneously, in part at least, until after leaving Portsmouth, as there are a large number of discourses in skeleton which were evidently filled up in delivery. After his removal to Fishkill, however, his sermons appear to have been always written out in full, and usually with much more care both as to penmanship and composition.

But despite what must thus be said as to his later preaching, Mr. Turner can be properly estimated only as he is

glorious in the apprehension of mortals than many of them had hitherto seen him. . . . I remember to have heard Ballou on this text, and it was certainly a powerful, evangelic discourse. His Conventional Sermon must have had a wonderful effect, for he is peculiarly happy in his defence of the Gospel as he has received it, and more than happy in overturning ancient systems. If he does not always convince by the sarcastic caustic of his blistering plasters, he seldom fails of leaving wounds and bruises and putrifying sores in the leprous body of modern divinity."

[23] For good specimens of his style and method, as also of the usual quality of his thought, see *Universalist Quarterly*, Vol. vi., *Arts.* I. and XXVIII., and Vol. vii., *Arts.* XI. and XVII. As the productions of a man seventy-three and seventy-four years old, they show, too, how well he retained his mental power.

recall him, this comes to me as the thought certain, first of all, to occur to one meeting him. He had a face of apostolic sweetness and benignity,[21] and his whole air and presence were in harmony with it. He was fully six feet in stature, spare, light-complexioned, with hair thin and grey ever after I knew him, and giving evident indications of a lack of physical stamina. In the pulpit he presented a fine figure, erect and dignified, compromised possibly by a little loll. But in walking he had a kind of roll, with a slight stoop, and with just a suggestion of weakness at the knees, which, while detracting little from the dignity of his bearing, took from him what would otherwise have been the firmness and elasticity of his tread. Were I required, indeed, to give the best possible idea of his general appearance, physically, I should say that, while it had in it nothing in the slightest degree awkward, or ungainly, it reminded one of a tall lad who has grown too rapidly, and whose gait and movements reveal the absence of the needed muscular development. This was the consequence of a severe illness, about 1809 or 1811. Previous to this, he is said to have been erect, robust, firm of step, weighing between two hundred and three hundred pounds. But recovering, he left his chamber another man, and ever after had the appearance described.

And this change in him physically seems to have been the outward expression of a corresponding change in him in other particulars. Before this sickness, like his friend Mr. Ballou, he had been exclusively an extemporaneous preacher, and is said to have been one of the "rousing" sort, live, vehement, electric.[22] But from this period his whole manner changed,

[21] There are three portraits of him: one in the possession of Mrs. Weld, taken while he was at Charlestown, when he was between forty and fifty; one in the possession of Mrs. Brewer, taken when he was about fifty; and one in the possession of Mrs. Brown, taken when he was between sixty and seventy. Mrs. Brown says, "*I* think mine the best, though others might see differently." Is it too much to hope that, at some time, we may have a picture of him from one of these?

[22] I find the following comment upon his preaching, and also upon that of Father Ballou, in a letter to Mr. Turner from Rev. G. Richards, dated Nov. 5, 1810. He says: "The secondary sermon [at Convention] delivered by yourself, I have no manner of doubt gave great satisfaction, as on this text I am certain that your *moon* shone in the splendors of the sun, and that the Sun of Righteousness appeared seven times more

and his ordinary preaching became subdued, languid, what is called "moderate," — at times, perhaps, even heavy. I have no personal recollections of his *preaching*, except such as a boy from eight to twelve years old might take along; but the memories I thus have are of a man of saintly visage, whom I loved to look at in the pulpit, but whose sermonizing always seemed to me dull. And the impression thus lingering with me is confirmed by an examination of the MSS. in my hands, among which are many of the sermons to which I listened, judging from their dates. Here and there, reading them, a terse and telling apothegm strikes us. Now and then, we come upon a sentence, or a series of sentences, pointedly and forcibly, perhaps eloquently, put. But for the most part, there is nothing stout, brilliant, or stirring. It is good, healthy, common-place thought, usually clearly arranged and smoothly expressed, though stated often with a good deal of formality, and sometimes with needless circumlocution.[23] And comparing authorities, we find them all agreeing that, during the latter part of his ministry, though always sound and instructive, he was, as the rule, a plodding and sometimes prosy talker, rather than the muscular and stirring preacher he was at the outset. Judging from his MSS., he did not relinquish preaching extemporaneously, in part at least, until after leaving Portsmouth, as there are a large number of discourses in skeleton which were evidently filled up in delivery. After his removal to Fishkill, however, his sermons appear to have been always written out in full, and usually with much more care both as to penmanship and composition.

But despite what must thus be said as to his later preaching, Mr. Turner can be properly estimated only as he is

glorious in the apprehension of mortals than many of them had hitherto seen him. . . . I remember to have heard Ballou on this text, and it was certainly a powerful, evangelic discourse. His Conventional Sermon must have had a wonderful effect, for he is peculiarly happy in his defence of the Gospel as he has received it, and more than happy in overturning ancient systems. If he does not always convince by the sarcastic caustic of his blistering plasters, he seldom fails of leaving wounds and bruises and putrifying sores in the leprous body of modern divinity."

[23] For good specimens of his style and method, as also of the usual quality of his thought, see *Universalist Quarterly*, Vol. vi., *Arts.* I. and XXVIII., and Vol. vii., *Arts.* XI. and XVII. As the productions of a man seventy-three and seventy-four years old, they show, too, how well he retained his mental power.

thought of as a large-minded and able man. The difficulty with him was that his mind partook of the languor of his bodily condition. It was an effort for him to think intensely and profoundly, and he was rarely so stirred down to the bottom of his being as to do this. Ordinarily, therefore, he only gave what was on the surface of his mind, or what came easily and without much effort to his lip, or pen, — the tame and facile flow of the water, running sluggishly over the dam. But he had immense latent power. At times, when kindled by some great occasion, or stirred by opposition, or some peculiar circumstance, this came out. Then he preached with all his old fire, and sometimes rose into impassioned and commanding eloquence. "All the fountains of the great deep" within him "were broken up," and thought and feeling came in a flood. Rev. Russell Streeter writes me, "On Convention occasions he was, on the whole, *second to no one.*" My parents tell me that he was "sometimes *very* animated." They speak particularly of one sermon in Portsmouth, called forth by some bitter outbreak of opposition, when he preached with surpassing effect. Others report similar instances. But no man can thus give out except from what is in him, and these occasional achievements were simply revelations of the great things of which Mr. Turner was capable, indicating the scale of his power.

Associated so intimately as the two men were for many years, it is almost impossible, thinking of Mr. Turner, not to ask, How did he compare with Mr. Ballou? Preaching side by side as, on all special occasions, they almost invariably did while Mr. Turner remained with us, comparisons of course did not then fail to be made between them; and I have never understood that they were, commonly, at all to Mr. Turner's disadvantage. The remark was, as I think I have heard it said, that "they usually came out about neck and neck." And there seems to be no reason to modify this judgment of their contemporaries, as we look back and compare them now. They were very unlike, as was remarked in opening. No two men could well differ more. But there can be no doubt that,

taken in his mental totality, Mr. Turner was fully the equal of Mr. Ballou, — possibly in some respects his superior. He had, indeed, few or none of the qualities which so remarkably fitted Mr. Ballou to be the popular leader and religious reformer he became. His mind was less original, incisive, aggressive. He had nothing of Mr. Ballou's instinct for controversy. He lacked a certain quality of simplicity and directness so conspicuous in Mr. Ballou; lacked his facility in illustration, his readiness in seizing points and turning tables; lacked his humor[24] and playfulness; lacked especially that singular *argumentum ad hominem* faculty, which enabled Mr. Ballou to put himself so immediately *en rapport* with his hearers, and thus to talk with them on their own level, straight to their common sense. But his mind, if not more massive, was more capacious; calmer; broader in its grasp; clearer and more profound in its insight; more inclusive in its range; deeper in its flow. Father Ballou was not above having his "crotchets"; — as we saw in the sketch of him, was not wholly superior to "fanciful notions" and crude conceits. Mr. Turner was. Not only were the tendencies of his thought more abstract and metaphysical, but his mind was more philosophical; while less purely ratiocinative, finer in its quality; more subtile; more judicial, because more impartially taking all sides of a subject into account; moving less in grooves, or straight lines, and more in sweeps and circuits.

Mr. Turner, moreover, was less exclusively intellectual than Mr. Ballou. His mind was rounder and more perfectly balanced. A man of no more moral integrity than Mr. Ballou, his intellections were more dominated and qualified by his moral and religious sentiments. Father Ballou was essentially, almost purely, a reasoner. He looked at everything from the stand-point of simple argument. A chance to

[24] This must be understood only of his preaching. His friend, Mr. Hudson, tells us that "a vein of quiet humor added attraction to his social intercourse"; and his daughter (Mrs. Brown) says that though "always grave and dignified, he was yet very genial and cheerful, having a great memory, with a fund of anecdote, fine colloquial powers, and a wealth of humor and information, which made him always an entertaining companion."

"query," or to air his logic, was seized as a hunter seizes the trail, or "show," of his favorite game; and having once fixed on a premise from which to start, mounting his logical hobby-horse, he let him have the bit to the end. No matter what spiritual laws, or testimonies of consciousness, others might clearly see were thus over-ridden; no matter what fatalistic or antinomian consequences, or what practical denials of the necessity of faith and repentance as conditions of salvation, others might allege as bars in his way; the "argument" must have its course. And, undeterred, frankly and in entire honesty, he accepted the conclusion, whatever it might be, always finding some method, satisfactory to himself, to explain or adjust the consequences. Mr. Turner, on the other hand, looked at everything from the moral stand-point. Whatever the question to be decided, he held it up in the light of moral consequence and spiritual law. In his judgment, these were standards more final and authoritative than any rule of induction, or deduction, possibly could be; and however inevitable, or invincible, the logic by which it seemed to be enforced, no conclusion that contravened our innate sense of accountability, or that invalidated the absoluteness and perpetual reality of moral distinctions in God's sight, could find a moment's hospitality in his thought. A clear, logical reasoner when occasion called, he had no taste for mere reasoning. He was no polemic; and with the almost exclusively aggressive and controversial form in which Universalism was usually administered, he had little or no sympathy. Looking over his MSS., one is struck with nothing, perhaps, so much as with the profound religious purpose, the spiritual sensibility and earnestness by which they are pervaded. Father Ballou was a religious man because he felt that he ought to be; because there were unanswerable reasons, logically, why he should be. Father Turner was a religious man — from a sense of duty, no doubt, but mainly as birds sing, and as flowers are fragrant — because so what was in him spontaneously expressed itself. Hence what are said to have been the fervor and unction of his prayers. Doctrinal sermons in abundance he preached;

but even those most argumentative and most sharply controversial were flavored with a religious meaning, and reasoned to practical ends. He never preached a sermon that was *merely* doctrinal, but always made dogmatic discussion subordinate to moral impression.

Mr. Turner, it is probably not too much to say, was the foremost man in our early Church in respect to scholarly and literary attainments. Dr. Ballou designates Messrs. Jones, Ballou, Kneeland and Turner as, in 1811, "the most active and influential of the Universalist ministry"; and speaking of his association, in successive years, with Messrs. Ballou, Jones, Dean and Wood, on a Committee to prepare a History of Universalism, Dr. Whittemore says that Mr. Turner "was better qualified undoubtedly than either of his associates"[25] for the work proposed. With what amount of academic training, or scholarship, he entered the ministry, we have no means of knowing. Nor is there any reason to believe that he was ever a systematic student. His note-books and memoranda, on the contrary, indicate a desultory and somewhat disjointed and miscellaneous way of doing things. But he had decided literary tastes. He was a large reader — a love of books being one of his passions even to the end. He was a thinker, too, holding his opinions as the results of his own mental processes — with a constant and consistent reference to all the fundamental principles of the Gospel, which made him, doubtless, not only the best-read, but the most systematic and comprehensive theologian among our primitive neophytes. He was no mean metaphysician, too; and were there space here for them, it could be well filled with a series of sentences and paragraphs, culled from his MSS., illustrating his clearness of perception and ability of statement in this field. He was, besides, well posted in history. And in addition to all the rest, he had a taste which made his style much less verbose and cumbersome than that of his associates who could write as correctly. His services, therefore, were in constant demand. In 1807, Messrs. Ballou and

[25] *Quarterly*, Vol. v., p. 386. *Life of Ballou*, Vol. iii., p. 28.

Kneeland having been the previous year appointed a Committee to prepare and publish a Hymn Book, Mr. Turner was added, and the book was brought out in 1808. In 1811, he was one of the projectors and editors of the *Gospel Visitant*,[26] a quarterly magazine of sixty-four pages, 8vo., which was published for a year, and then, after a lapse of five years, revived and published again for a year.[27] In 1813, he informed the Convention of a correspondence opened with English Universalists.[28] In 1815, he was appointed Chairman of a Committee on a "seminary of science."[29] In 1816, he was made Chairman of the Committee, above referred to, to prepare a

[26] In one of Mr. Turner's note-books, I find the records of the meetings of the *Gloucester Conference* (See *Life of Ballou*, Vol. i., p. 353), out of which this publication grew. The first meeting was held at Gloucester, Jan. 23, 1811. The records are interesting, because giving the questions presented, with the names of those offering them and of those to whom they were assigned. The rule was — "That all questions or statements proposed shall have relation to the cause of religion, and shall become subjects of discussion by being admitted worthy thereof by a majority of the members of the Conference, in which case they shall be recorded, with the names of those to whom they are committed. Such questions and statements shall be discussed in writing during the recess of the Conference, and the answers and observations to them, if admitted by vote, shall be lodged with the Clerk." This was, doubtless, our first "Ministerial Circle."

In the same book are, also, the records of the *Southern Association* — which subsequently became so important a body — from the date of its formation, Dec. 13, 1815, to June 19, 1819. It met semi-annually, and seems to have been an outgrowth of the *Gloucester Conference*, as the expediency of reviving the *Gospel Visitant* was one of the questions discussed at the first meeting. And here it may not be uninteresting to note that, at the meeting, June 10, 1817, a Committee of five were appointed "to consider the expediency of instituting a society, to be called the Massachusetts Universalist Bible Society," and that, at the next meeting, they "reported that, as far as their means of knowledge extend, they have not found a want of Bibles to exist without the individual power of obtaining them, and that they know of no circumstances sufficient to justify the establishment of such a society AT PRESENT."

[27] It may be mentioned, as indicating his interest in this kind of work, that he subsequently (in 1823) published the *Evangelical Repertory*, a monthly, 16 pp. octavo, at 75 cents per year. It was short-lived, however, only a few numbers being issued.

[28] The entry in the *Manuscript Records* is that the Convention was "certified by letter from Edward Turner that in the recess of this body a correspondence had been opened with brethren of like faith in England, which promised a happy and beneficial effect. The letters from thence were produced and read to the great joy and satisfaction of the Conventional body."

[29] The Resolution reads "that it is expedient to raise by subscription the sum of $5000, to be divided into two hundred shares of $25 each, the interest of which only shall be applied to the support of the institution, and that a Committee be appointed to obtain the subscription of said shares." *Manuscript Records.*

History of Universalism.[30] In 1817, he was associated with

[30] Dr. Whittemore (*Life of Ballou*, Vol. iii., pp. 28, 29) gives the prospectus of the book issued by the Committee as last constituted (Ballou, Turner and Wood), in Sept., 1820, and adds that the "work never appeared, nor have we any evidence that it was ever written. The proposals for publication were made in haste, probably through the eagerness of Mr. Wood." I am happy to say, however, that among the papers of Mr. Turner which have come into my hands, I find the syllabus of the book, as follows: "General outlines of a plan for a history of the rise, progress and establishment of Universalism in America, with the present state and number of the societies in the North American States, etc. *Introduction*. This will embrace a view of the objects contemplated in this production, with such prefatory remarks as may appear proper. *Chapter* 1. View of the causes which produced the promulgation of Universalism in America. Brief notices of some preachers. *Chapter* 2. Opposition to this doctrine. Its ostensible and real causes. General success. *Chapter* 3. Societies formed. Their compacts of association. Difficulties. Conduct under those difficulties. *Chapter* 4. Convention formed. Its objects. General plan of association. Utility of the Convention to the several societies. *Chapter* 5. Increase of societies in New England. *Chapter* 6. Present number and state of societies in New England and other States. Periods when formed. *Chapter* 7. Concise view of Universalist writers. Their general tenets — and wherein [they] agreed and disagreed. *Chapter* 8. General character of some preachers of Universalism. Mr. Winchester — Mr. Murray — Mr. Streeter [Adam] — Mr. Barns. *Chapter* 9. Some account of this doctrine in Europe, particularly in England and Scotland. *Conclusion*." I find, also, the *first* of these chapters, apparently incomplete, — the *fourth*, seemingly complete, and the *eighth*, giving a sketch of Murray. It is not improbable that a thorough examination of Mr. Turner's MSS. might discover other chapters — perhaps the whole. I find, too, notes of early Universalists, English extracts, and other material; — all showing, as against Dr. Whittemore's "no evidence," that the book, if not entirely written, was so far prepared that it could easily have been finished and put to press, if the requisite number of subscribers had been obtained. Of these, however, I judge from a list which is, probably, the list of subscribers to the History, there were only about two hundred. The incomplete chapter, sketching Murray, here follows. It has a special interest in connection with the historical associations of our Centenary Year, and it is valuable because giving an impartial judgment of the man from one who intimately knew him.

"SECTION ——. *Brief account of some of the preachers of the doctrine of Universal Salvation.* — It is not easy to determine at this time, nor is it of much importance, who was the first propagator of Universalism in this country. Mr. John Murray, a native of England, who arrived in America before the commencement of the Revolutionary War, had preached the doctrine in New Jersey, in Philadelphia and New York some time previous to his coming into New England; and at about the same period, Mr. Adam Streeter had attracted considerable attention as a preacher in New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Rhode Island. We think that the question in regard to priority in point of time can lie only between these two; and the probability is that, though the labors of the one were principally performed at the Southward, and those of the other limited to the Northern States, yet they were nearly simultaneous. The Life of Mr. Murray having been published since his death, and circulated considerably among our societies, it will be the less necessary to enter very minutely into his history. We shall do no more, in this place, than merely sketch a brief outline of his character as an early laborer in the vineyard of the Lord, and a firm and undaunted soldier, 'enduring hardness' in the cause of 'the Captain of our salvation.'

In point of doctrine, Mr. Murray was really and professedly a disciple of Mr. Relley,

Messrs. Ballou and Dean to prepare a new Hymn Book, which was afterwards issued, compiled by him and Mr. Ballou. These things indicate the high position Mr. Turner held in the estimation of his brethren, as well as what was understood to be the line of his ability and tastes.

It would, doubtless, be a stretch of truth to say that Mr. Turner was a poet. He lacked the gift of poetic expression, and was probably seldom or never quickened to the "fine

whose peculiar views of the Gospel need not be detailed here, as they were explained at large in the department of this work to which they properly belong. In the manner of his preaching, Mr. Murray was always greatly interesting and could command the most profound attention in the greatest audiences. It has been often said that Mr. Whitefield was his model, and it is not unlikely that, from his intercourse with that gentleman in early life, having been a member of his communion, and from the regard and reverence he bore to him, he might, without intention, have copied his manner in proportion as he imbibed his spirit. He was powerful, yet cool and dispassionate in argument. He possessed a vast acquaintance with the Scriptures; and few men could apply with so much ease and readiness their figurative expressions, to illustrate the great doctrine of the Gospel. To a fervid imagination and a vigorous intellect, he had in addition a strong and retentive memory, which had ever been much exercised. He had read many theological works, the principal features of which he always distinctly recollected; and he could, frequently, when quoting an author in public, give his ideas in his own words. It has been sometimes urged against Mr. Murray that he indulged too much in a spirit of sarcasm and satiric wit. That he possessed these powers is well known, and that, at certain times, he employed them is not denied. We believe, however, that in the later periods of his life he sincerely regretted his use of those powers in his public character. To the writer of this article he once said, 'If you possess wit, if you have a talent for satire, never cultivate, never indulge in them. They will not produce you any sincere friends; they will make you many enemies. It is no way to catch birds, by casting stones at them.'

Mr. Murray was a chaplain in the American army during a great part of the Revolution, and for a considerable time attached to the family of Gen. Washington. His first establishment in the ministry was at Gloucester, on Cape Ann; the next and last, at Boston, where a large and respectable society had been gathered by his instrumentality. He continued to labor with them in word and doctrine constantly, with the exception of visiting, once in a few years, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New York, etc., in which places he had numerous friends, until the autumn of 1809, when he was seized with a paralysis which interrupted his regular labors; and except in a few instances when he was carried into the pulpit, he never preached more. Still his mental powers were not so much impaired as we should have expected from his age and the nature of his disease; and [in] his protracted hours of pain and languor, we have often been struck with admiration at that force of genius and activity of mind which he continued to exhibit. The faith which he had so long preached to others was his spiritual support under all his infirmities; and on the 3d of September, 1815, he quietly departed this life, in the 'hope, full of immortality.' Thus died one who, when our country was, morally, a wilderness, 'went forth weeping, yet bearing precious seed,' and lived to see that seed spring up and flourish, and to 'return again rejoicing, and bringing his sheaves with him.' "

phrenzy" of the poetic fire. His temperament was too languid, and his mind too metaphysical for this. Hence his prose writings show an almost utter absence of the poetic element, and are seldom relieved by a figure, or lighted up by so much as the faintest imagery. Yet his note-books preserve several pieces which exhibit not a little of the poetic instinct, while those familiar with our Hymn Books will not need to be told that he is to be reckoned as one of the best of our hymnologists. That fine hymn for dismissal,

"Kind Lord, before thy face,"—

that grand choral to the praise of Christ,

"Come, sing a Saviour's power,"

and the hymn commencing,

"Hear what a Saviour's voice
To sinners does proclaim,"

not to mention others less familiar, sufficiently attest his merits in this respect. One of his productions,

"The Lord, our Shepherd, feeds his flock,
And shades them with the towering rock,"

is but little inferior to Addison's famous hymn as a paraphrase of the twenty-third Psalm; while others, which may be found in Streeter's Collection and in the Collections which he helped to compile, give emphatic witness not only to the devoutness of his spirit, but to his metrical ability and his almost poetic talent.

For some reason which does not appear, Mr. Turner seems to have opposed the adoption of the *Winchester Confession*, in 1803.[31] It would be interesting to know the grounds upon

[31] This is said on the authority of Rev. N. Stacy, quoted in *Life of Ballou*, Vol. i. p. 179. And as everything helping us to understand the state of feeling then existing is important, I transcribe a passage from a letter of Rev. G. Richards (who advocated the *Confession*) to Mr. Turner, dated April 2, 1804, giving us an "inside view" of things at this session of the Convention. He says:

"I am pleased that our beloved Brother Murray has it at heart to visit in his way, and [I] can only regret that I fear his countenance is not toward me as it has been. Could I have thought that the conversation which took place between you, Ballou and myself at the Conventional table would have produced such a scene of confusion and wrath as it did, my tongue should have been palsied in eternal silence. And B.'s telling Bro. M [urray], when we wished to soften matters, that I was the very man who had awakened all his suspicions by what I had told him, appeared to me a very ungracious thing. To speak plain truth, there was something cuttingly unkind in the man-

which he did so, inasmuch as he was one of the wisest of our practical workers, as he was one of the most earnest and sagacious of our primitive organizers. In this respect, he was doubtless the superior of Mr. Ballou. His mind was more constructive. He was a better builder. With no taste for polemic warfare, he was naturally interested in whatever could help to promote a deeper and more systematic Christian culture, or to give coherence, harmony and effectiveness to the discipline and methods of our forming Church. In nothing, probably, are we more indebted to him as one of the leading minds in our early history than for his positive and healthful influence in these directions. Much as he abhorred their doctrines, he did not therefore dislike the methods of the "orthodox," but was willing to learn from every good thing which they had to suggest. In some respects, one of the most determined of theological reformers, he was, at the same time, in a marked degree discriminating and conservative, willing to give up nothing that could at all serve the practical ends in which he saw the final purpose of Christianity, and which were always most in his thoughts. Hence he was among the very first to favor Sunday Schools, and long anticipated the general sentiment of the denomination by organizing one in Portsmouth as early as 1825.[32] Hence, also, the formation, in May, 1827, in the same parish, of what was, *perhaps*, the first Bible Class in the denomination — though on this point, as to the early formation of Bible

ner and the way in which B. brought the matter to a crisis. . . . At the same time, while I think B.'s conduct was far from being commendable in its manner, and the spirit of that evening taken together has nearly determined my future absence from the annual Conventions, I am free to confess that Brother M. was equally wrong in his high-handed opposition to the Articles of Faith, for it was a subject of which he could not judge, and with which he had no manner of business; but feeling a little like David when Joab besieged Rabbah, he determined to put us under the axes and harrows of his *wit*, and to pass us through a brick-kiln whose fires himself had kindled."

[32] Precisely when this school was formed, I cannot say. My impression is, some time during the spring of the year above named, as I had been a member of it, I think, some two or three months when I was stricken down in July by the catastrophe which, for a season, took me from all schools. It was suspended before the following winter, when I was able to be out again. This will correct the statement of Rev. L. Willis, in his *Semi-Centennial Discourse*, at Salem, Mass. (June, 1859), to the effect that the Sunday School instituted by him at Salem in May, 1829, "was the first in our denomination this side of Boston, and the third known to exist among Universalists."

Classes, I am not informed.[33] For the same reason, amidst a very general re-actionary indifference on the part of both ministers and people with regard to the church, he was an insistant advocate for it, and the increase of church-membership was always one of the things nearest his heart — as would be inferred from what has been said of the peculiarly religious aim of his preaching. For the same reason, too, had he continued with us long enough, he would have been among the earliest friends of a Theological School and of a higher standard of ministerial qualifications, — perhaps would have been one of the first to urge their necessity; and he was, for this same reason, in all denominational matters, a believer in rules and — though in his great mistake, his secession from us, he seems strangely to have forgotten it — a strict constructionist as to their enforcement. Writing, in 1827, in a letter to Rev. L. Willis, touching the then existing looseness, he said:

"It is evident something needs to be done. I am extremely sorry the Convention did not, in the most pointed and explicit manner, express its disapprobation of the —— Association, in the case of ——. That case was amply provided for by the rule established in 1824, and the course pursued by the Association is directly opposed to our rule, and, if countenanced, or not disapprobated, throws us back exactly where we were before the rule was established. Why should we adopt rules and suffer them to be broken over, and give even a tacit countenance to their violation? *I am heart-sick of this doing and undoing, and subjecting everything to a supposed expediency.*"

These italics are mine, used to emphasize an expression

[33] It may, also, be mentioned, as indicating the practical drift of his thought, and what doubtless, had he remained with us, he would have been as one of our *working* leaders, that, writing to Rev. L. Willis, in 1825, touching the business likely to come before the Convention, then near, he suggested that it should establish a Fund for deceased ministers' families.

And though it has no immediate connection with Mr. Turner, let it be added here, as a sign of our early methods, that a letter from Rev. G. Richards to Mr. Turner, dated Aug. 20, 1804, shows that our societies were then expected to contribute funds for the Convention, as Mr. R. explains that "circumstances have hindered a public contribution" for this purpose, and requests Mr. T. "to deposit on the table ten dollars as the donation of the Portsmouth society."

which reveals the whole man. He had a clear perception of principles, and a profound appreciation of the importance of method. He believed, therefore — as much in the realm of religious as in the domain of civil and social interests — in order, government, law, and a rigid adherence to them: not as against freedom — for no man was a more strenuous advocate of religious liberty, but as against license, and for freedom's sake. This appeared in his whole work as one of the organizing minds of our Church — only obscured finally in the manner in which he withdrew; and had he remained with us, he would, unlike Father Ballou, have taken a leading position among those who, out of our former chaos, have labored to evoke order and an effective church-method and church-life.

It was, unquestionably, this peculiar practical cast of his mind which lay at the root of the various causes that concurred, finally, to bring about his secession. No man was more thoroughly a Universalist than he; and among all his associates, no one had been more earnest, more willing to do, or more ready to sacrifice in behalf of his faith. Let us see how, notwithstanding, he was gradually alienated and, at last, separated from us.[34]

Up to about 1814–15, the doctrine of future punishment can hardly be said to have been questioned among us. Held on various grounds as to its philosophy, the idea that the painful consequences of sin somehow extend beyond the grave was

[34] Let me say, once for all, that the personal details involved in what follows are given for purely historical purposes, without conscious bias. Of course, I am not unaware how delicate is the ground I traverse; and had it not been that this whole case has been represented so entirely to the disadvantage of Mr. Turner, I should not have thought it worth while to re-open it. But finding it necessary, if his true position and character were to be understood, to vindicate Mr. Turner from the imputations under which he has so long rested, and finding the facts, public and personal, so inextricably interwoven that justice could be done to him only as they were fully set forth, I have felt it my duty to present them as, by and by; they will have to be studied if this sad but interesting portion of our history is ever to be truly written. Private relations and personal feelings not unfrequently thus become the most important elements of public history. I trust the period to which this narrative pertains is so far behind us, and the spirit of the controversy so entirely gone, that it is not among the remotest possibilities that the old feeling can be re-awakened, or the dead embers rekindled, by a severely impartial presentation of the facts.

almost undisputed. Some of the opinions of Father Ballou logically issued in the doctrine of the immediate felicity of all at death; but the Bible was thought to teach future punishment, and in deference to this authority, he accepted it. As might have been expected, however, the logical consequences of his fundamental postulates touching the subject began in time to assert themselves — at first, interrogatively; then more positively. From 1814 to 1817, therefore, the question gradually pushed itself into discussion. Precisely how, when, or by whom, the issue was first distinctly made, there is probably now no record to show.[35] Mr. Jacob Wood, of whom more will by and by be said, was fellowshipped by the General Convention in 1816, and immediately gave himself to an effort to have the Convention "take a decided stand in favor of the doctrine of future punishment" — which indicates that the opposite doctrine already had avowed believers; and in 1817, mainly through Mr. Wood's agency, a discussion of the subject was arranged between Messrs. Ballou and Turner. Father Ballou has told us that he could not say that he "was *fully* satisfied that the Bible taught no punishment in the future world, until" he "obtained this satisfaction" during the progress of this discussion[36] — which evidently implies that he had become *nearly* satisfied, — or, at least, that his mind was travelling very decidedly in this direction. The letters were published in the *Gospel Visitant*, and those curious in such matters can find what purports to be a summary of them in Dr. Whittemore's *Life of Ballou*.[37] Dr. W., as is known, was an intense partizan of Father Ballou, and whether or not the summary is an impartial one, I cannot say, having never seen the originals. The presumption is that it is impartial. The discussion had two important results: it led Mr.

[35] The earliest assertion of what afterwards became Mr. Ballou's doctrine of no-future punishment, which I have as yet discovered, is reported in a letter of Rev. G. Richards to Mr. Turner, dated Feb. 3, 1810. Speaking of his people in Philadelphia, he says:

"In point of doctrine, they . . appear extremely various. Many of them, I am led to think, really suppose that virtue and vice are the same in essence; . . that death levels all distinctions between one and another; and that futurity presents one unclouded scene of glory, in the article of death, to every individual of the human race."

[36] *Life of Ballou*, Vol. ii., p. 29. [37] Vol. ii., pp. 27–49.

Ballou at once to commit himself against future punishment; and it gave its first serious shock to the long-existing friendship between him and Mr. Turner.[38] Some abatement from the warmth of their personal sympathy was, perhaps, to be expected when they found themselves positively committed to views so wide apart; but the radical cause of the breach, it must be said, was that Mr. Turner's faith in the candor of his friend was shaken by his use of the famous text, 1 Pet. iii. 18–20. Five years before, Mr. Ballou had given an exposition of this passage, in which, interpreting it as meaning that "the Gospel was preached to those who were not in the flesh, that they might be judged as if they were in the flesh, but that they might live according to God in the spirit," he had declared that "there is not the slightest ambiguity" in the text, and intimated that it could be understood differently only by those "disposed to learn [teach] the Scriptures how to talk."[39] It would, therefore, be difficult to express the surprise of Mr. Turner when, on quoting the words, he was met by the statement that the apostle's meaning was that Christ "went and preached to the Gentiles who were dead in trespasses and sins, and of a character similar to those people who were destroyed by the flood."[40] He felt that his friend had done precisely what he had so severely condemned in his preceding article, and this, too, without making the slightest allusion to that article, or at all explaining his change. Mr. Turner was not only surprised, but grieved and astounded. That he greatly erred in suspecting Father Ballou of being consciously uncandid, or of being disposed to put a meaning into the passage which he did not honestly find there, is certain. The interpretation, though original with Mr. Ballou,

[38] *Ibid.* pp. 48, 49.

[39] *Life of Ballou*, Vol. i. pp. 366–69. The words here are, "learn the Scriptures how to *teach*"; but Rev. R. Streeter says the original article reads as above. The records of the *Gloucester Conference*, referred to in a preceding note, show that "a discussion" of "Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison" [unquestionably this paper] was read among other papers "on important subjects on which Brother Ballou had written," at a meeting, Nov. 20, 1811, and was ordered to be "inserted in a future number of the *Gospel Visitant*."

[40] *Life of Ballou*, Vol. ii., pp. 37–45.

was not peculiar to him, and was held by eminent critics before, and has been held by many interpreters since, whose respect for the Bible would make any intended violence to its meaning impossible. But the exposition was then so novel, — it came so unexpectedly, and was so in contradiction of his friend's previous exposition, that Mr. Turner could not but be astonished. Even Dr. Ballou, years after, having this as well as other interpretations in mind, said that nothing connected with the subject would ever suggest to a reader "any interpretation essentially different from the historico-grammatical one, unless he had some contrary prepossession to lead him off," in which case, he added, "the text would have to yield."[41] This was Mr. Turner's thought, as the exposition came upon him like a thunder-clap from a clear sky, and the completeness of his confidence, and therefore the cordiality of his friendship, gave way under the shock. Though he was probably, at the time, totally unconscious of any such effect, this was, really, the first blow towards separating him from us.

Finding himself at last fully settled in his new conclusion, Mr. Ballou seems to have given it more and more prominence, and under his lead, seconded by active and earnest lieutenants — of whom Thomas Whittemore was chief — the drift of the denomination was very soon with him. The effect upon Mr. Turner and those sympathizing with him can readily be imagined. The new doctrine, in their judgment, was not only false, but mischievous. Whether they were right, or wrong, in so thinking, it is no part of the purpose of this sketch to discuss. It is enough that they, honestly, so thought. They felt that the denomination was being moved from its old and true foundations; that the good name of Universalism was being compromised; that just occasion was being given to suspect its moral influence, and that in every way the effect of the new teaching was bad. They felt, moreover, that the denomination was likely to suffer from the too exclusively controversial style of preaching, which was becom-

[41] *Universalist Quarterly*, Vol. x., p. 222.

ing prevalent. It was, in their judgment, too personally bitter, and therefore lacking that high moral and religious tone required for Christian usefulness. Nor were these things all. Not only, as they believed, was the denomination being committed to a new and false position, but what had been the doctrine of all its founders and friends up to that time was being — not simply denied, but assailed; ridiculed; often, as they thought they had reason to complain, seriously misrepresented. The guns which had hitherto been aimed at the enemy, so to speak, were now being turned against members of the household.[42] Conventions and public meetings were used to attack the old and put forward the new doctrine, while, if the friends of the latter presented their side, or essayed its defence, they were charged with fomenting strife.[43] Ministers believing the old doctrine, moreover, could not preach it without exciting more or less remonstrance and commotion. In the nature of things, under these circumstances, a crisis was inevitable. Dr. Whittemore is at great pains to represent Father Ballou as throughout anxious for peace, and as indisposed to break friendship, or to make his new doctrine a test of position or fellowship. Doubtless, these representations are substantially correct — though, if so inclined, one might be tempted to suspect the over-zeal with which they are pressed and reiterated, and to say, "You do

[42] Writing to Rev. R. Streeter, Oct. 24, 1822, Mr. Turner said:

"You fear the consequences of what you call a war with brethren. I venerate the principle which prompted this fear, because I know it to be good. But . . . are we not already at wàr? Does not every *Magazine* warmly advocate the doctrine which we deny? I know not but we may as well fight in regular form, in proper battalions, as to knock each other about in a promiscuous group, called by the same name. . . . I consider the scheme which we oppose as opposite to revelation as the denial of any other article contained in the Word."

Again, the following January, he writes to the same brother:

"While I disavow the intention of separation on my part, I think that those who appear to be so much agitated at the idea of one, ought to show that the difference between the parties is verbal or modal, and then set a conciliatory example by refraining from controversy."

[43] See, for example, *Life of Ballou*, Vol. i., p. 417, where, having referred to certain "evil consequences" flowing from the discussion between Messrs. Ballou and Turner, Dr. Whittemore says, "These were some of the earliest evil consequences which the discussion of the doctrine of future limited punishment had created among Universalists." So the matter was usually put. But was it not, in fact, the discussion of the doctrine of *no*-future punishment that occasioned the "evil consequences," since it is conceded that the latter was the new and disturbing element in the denomination?

protest too much." But the doctrine became a test, nevertheless. The tide of the hour was with Father Ballou; and no one who knew him, or Dr. Whittemore, or who ever heard them preach, can have any doubt as to the use they made of this tide, or as to the strenuousness, or persistency, with which they, and others under their lead, pressed their doctrine, and pushed the war against future punishment. It was hardly in human nature, and especially in human nature so combative as theirs, to do otherwise. As little was it in human nature that the believers in future punishment should fail, on their part, to feel disturbed, annoyed, indignant.

At length, the outbreak came. The famous "Declaration and Appeal" appeared. An account of these papers may be found in Dr. Whittemore's *Life of Ballou*,[44] with the judgment of himself and his associates in regard to them and the motives of those concerned in them — a judgment which seems throughout to assume that there was honest conviction, or any sense of duty, only on the side of Father Ballou and his friends. But neither all the virtues nor all the faults are likely to be exclusively on either side in such a controversy. Various motives no doubt mingled to induce this action. Six men counselled and concurred in it, viz., Rev. Messrs. Jacob Wood, Paul Dean, Barzillai Streeter, Levi Briggs, Edward Turner and Charles Hudson. Mr. Dean, though no doubt a good, was a somewhat vain and very ambitious man. He had attained a leading position in Boston and the denomination, which he probably felt was endangered by the celebrity and growing influence of Mr. Ballou, and it is not, perhaps, uncharitable to impute to him a good deal of personal feeling in the case. Mr. Wood, the Mephistopheles of the whole transaction, though "a person of some fine qualities," as Dr. Whittemore says, was, as he adds, "ambitious and very meddlesome." He seems to have been one of those restless characters who are never content unless they are riding some hobby, and whose hobbies are always of the disturbing sort. From his first appearance upon our stage to his exit, he acted

[44] Vol. ii., pp. 214–224.

only in one *rôle*—that of agitator and general mischief-maker.[45] Of Mr. Briggs, I know nothing. Mr. Streeter was a nervous and eccentric man, it is believed *then* of good intentions.[46] As to Mr. Hudson, the high esteem in which he has always since been held, both on account of his ability and character, and the manner in which he has passed through all the temptations of his long and eminent political career, will not permit us to impute any other than honorable motives to him; while Mr. Turner, by the very qualities of his nature, was utterly incapable of a mean act, or of being other than a high-minded and honest man. So far as these last two

[45] These portraits of Mr. Dean and Mr. Wood have been drawn after a careful study of all accessible information *on both sides*. Rev. L. Willis, however, who knew both men well and to whom the above has been submitted, thinks that, "without intending it," I have "done them injustice." It is due them, therefore, that his opinion should be given. He says: "Jacob Wood was a vigorous writer and a good preacher. He had a clear head, and was sound in argument. He was very firm and well-established in his views as a Restorationist, and felt it to be his duty to preach them. Perhaps his strong aversion to [Mr. Ballou's] belief led him sometimes to speak imprudently, and, it may be, to act precipitately. . . . It was something for Dr. Whittemore to admit that he had '*some* fine qualities.' Mr. Wood was very active in getting up the 'Declaration and Appeal'; but I do not regard him as 'the Mephistopheles of the whole transaction,' for I know that others were also very active, and as determined as he. . . . That Paul Dean was '*ambitious*,' I can admit. But if he were ambitious to promote what he really believed to be God's truth, and if he had an ardent desire to gain and deserve the esteem of all good men, he did well. And I must say that during an intimate acquaintance with him for about fifteen years, I never saw anything that indicated he was ambitious except to do what would advance the interests of humanity and religion. His principal aim was to be a useful minister of Christ. I would use some term less offensive than '*vain*' in characterizing him. He was a better man and Christian than many suppose from what his opposers have said of him."

[46] Mr. Hudson, whose judgment I solicited concerning the above descriptions of his old associates, writes me:

"I am inclined to think that your opinion of Jacob Wood is rather *severe*. I knew him well. He was a kind-hearted man. He was decided in his opinions, open, frank, and generally spoke out all that he felt for the moment. He was fond of argument and controversy, and of course appeared worse than he was.

In the case of Paul Dean, there was one element which you have not noticed, but which probably had considerable influence upon his mind. He was a *Trinitarian*, of the Sabellian school, and of course had a kind of Calvinistic notion of salvation, which I could never comprehend, but on which he was always very sensitive.

Levi Briggs was rather a *small* man, of but little force of character. He would take no decided ground of himself.

Barzillai Streeter was a man of good talents, active and energetic, and was as decided in his opposition to the doctrine and policy of Mr. Ballou as any one of his associates. Nay, being of a warm temperament, he would at times speak out quite as freely as any one. Perhaps he and Wood might with propriety be said to have been the most forward in the 'Appeal' and 'Declaration.' He stood well in the denomination at that time, and had considerable influence. I think he was then honest."

men were concerned, certainly (not now to speak of the others, though it would not, perhaps, be an unwarrantable stretch of charity to say the same thing of the most of them, *probably*), the *animus* of these papers was not the bad and factious spirit which the account given by Dr. Whittemore represents. With no wish to disturb the harmony of the denomination, or to deny or impinge upon the right of any brother to hold whatever the Bible might teach him as truth, — with no disposition to withdraw fellowship, or to break friendship, they desired only, in view of the prominence given to the new doctrine and the warfare waged against the old, to advertise the public that the denomination as such had not swung away from its old moorings, and frankly to say what was the estimate in which the doctrine of the immediate felicity of the sinful at death was held by not a few of those who were still in the denomination and workers for it. Whether it was expedient, under the circumstances, that any document for such a purpose should have been thought of, each reader will judge for himself. But that it was a great mistake to put forth precisely such documents as these were, nobody, it is believed, now doubts. There was a meeting of those concerned, for consultation,[47] and the substance of what was to be published was agreed upon. But the papers were not put into form. This was left to the man, of the whole number, probably, least fitted for so delicate a task. As the result, the documents, as now read, are seen to have been not only objectionable in spirit and some of their phraseology, but unfortunate in statement, enabling the other side, in their rejoinder, clearly to convict them of inconsistency. In nothing, indeed, does the judgment of those concerned seem to

[47] Mr. Hudson says:

"The meeting to which you allude was not as formal as you seem to suppose. All the persons named were not present, I think, at any one meeting, nor were the papers drawn np and submitted. There was a general understanding that something of the kind would be published, and Mr. Wood, it was understood, would prepare it. I am not aware that these papers were ever submitted in full to any one before they were published. I know they were not to all. One fact shows the manner in which these papers were gotten up: After the names you have mentioned were given as those who would stand by them, and several severe attacks had been made upon them, Rev. S. C. Loveland, of Vermont, came out of his own accord, and allowed himself to be considered as one of the authors, because he had frequently expressed himself in conversation with some of the authors as approving of their policy."

have been more at fault throughout this whole business than in allowing such a determining influence to Mr. Wood as their leader and spokesman; and that such a man as Mr. Turner, belonging to an order of mind so much larger, and to an order of character so much superior, should have allowed himself to be so led and influenced by such a man as Jacob Wood, is one of those moral and intellectual anomalies which occasionally amaze us, as they seem to reverse our mathematics by demonstrating that the less is more than the greater.[48]

[Part II., concluding the Sketch, will appear in the July number.]

Article IX.

Dr. Patton on Universalism.

Twenty-five years ago the "orthodox" press and clergy declared, unanimously, that Universalism was as good as dead. From a number of the *New York Evangelist*, of that date, we make the following extract:

"It (Universalism) has had its day; it has done its mischief; it is now waning in its high places faster than it ever came forth in its strength. . . . The town of Gloucester has for many years been celebrated for its fisheries and its Universalism; yet in all the parishes, except the harbor, Universalism has only a name. At the harbor the sect has a

[48] This influence of Wood is the more remarkable because Mr. Turner seems not to have been unaware of the qualities which so unfitted him for leadership. In a letter to Rev. R. Streeter, Jan. 21, 1823 (a copy of which I find among Mr. T.'s papers), he says:

"I have known that the person whom you mention . . . [Wood] is naturally impetuous, and less guarded by prudence than I could wish; and that he has been inclined to a separation is no news to me. I have always endeavored to restrain his impetuosity, and have never countenanced the plan of a separation, though I have been convinced that the controversy, if it did not soon subside, would end in" one.

Writing also to Rev. H. Ballou, 2d, a few weeks after, he said:

"If you have found new evidence against Brother Wood, let it be adduced, and weigh what it ought to weigh against him. I am not responsible for his individual errors, nor are you (as I conceive) authorized to reason from them to conclusions especting my own character."

house of worship. . . . When the pastor is sick or absent the house is closed. . . . In Boston the leading church is Mr. Ballou's. . . . It has been languishing for years. Mr. Chapin did what he could to revive it, but he gave it no permanent prosperity. . . . Several of the popular ministers have come out openly in rejection of the Bible. . . . Many of the preachers of the faith find it difficult to get employ. Some have turned dentists, and some practice botanic medicine. . . . Such being the condition of this pernicious heresy, the real policy is to *let them alone;* they be blind leaders of the blind, and both the leaders and the led will eventually fall into the ditch!"

This is a specimen of what was very current in "orthodox" newspapers twenty-five years ago. The story that Universalism was dying, and if "let alone" would speedily die, was believed, we doubt not, by a very large majority of both clergy and laity. But how surely time corrects our misapprehensions touching the progress of truth, and its prospects; how certainly it brings about its revenges! The scales are falling from the eyes of our opponents. The great bell of Divine Providence is ringing in the anniversary of our first hundred years in America. All over the land the people hear its jubilant notes, and they understand their meaning. There are thousands in the so-called "orthodox" churches who listen, and secretly rejoice. They rejoice that Universalism still lives; that its great central truth, the restoration of all souls to holiness and happiness, goes marching steadily on to victory. And this, perhaps, is the chief reason why the "let-alone" policy is abandoned. Surely, the wrath of man shall praise the Lord!

Dr. Patton, who has lately been laboring in the columns of the *Advance*, once more feels himself greatly moved, and again comes forward to the attack. Not satisfied with the result of his articles in the *Advance*, he now seeks audience with the readers of *The New Englander*. He solicits the attention of the ministry. Doubtless, too, he strikes the keynote of a general forward movement. He realizes that to-day Universalism is a power in the land; that it is a potential

influence among the people; that it is more able, and more active, and numerically stronger than ever before. The proclamation of its dying condition twenty-five years ago, is now painfully felt to be false. Let us discuss it anew, says Dr. Patton. "How marvellous are thy ways, O Thou King of saints!"

Dr. Patton opens his article in the *New Englander* with certain extraordinary admissions, to which we would ask the special attention of the reader. He says that Universalism is "a subject so close to human feelings" that "there need be no apology for discussing" it. He declares that "*it attracts increased attention daily in the theological world*"! He acknowledges that "the thought is also attractive to our reason, that the universe will be in complete harmony with itself; that God will use methods in the lapse of ages, by which sin and misery shall be terminated, and holiness and happiness characterize all his rational creatures. *We can hardly conceive*," he continues, "*that a good man should be without sympathy with such longings and hopes*"! Dr. Patton also admits that the doctrine of Universalism was "entertained by John Frederick Oberlin, and John Foster, *after an examination of the subject in the light of reason and the Word of God*." "Not a few Christians," he tells us, "lean decidedly towards that belief, while the contrary view is accepted by yet others *only with painful doubt and a sense of conflict*"! "Learned orthodox commentators," he says, "such as Neander, Tholuck, Olshausen, and Lange," favor Universalism. We fancy that it cost Dr. Patton a pang to make these remarkable admissions, but they are unequivocal proof of his honesty. No doubt it would have been more congenial to his feelings could he have declared conscientiously that Universalism is utterly and finally dead, and have written its epitaph. But that he could not do; and so he puts on his armor, and girds himself for the fray. We will endeavor to hear him candidly, and attend closely to his argument. With the blessing of the Divine Providence, we hope to prove, in the sequel, that God has nowhere given the lie to the "sure word

of promise," nor to the reason he has put into our heads, nor to the faith he has put into our hearts. We hope to be able to show that the horrible ill to humanity, to angels, to all good souls, to God himself, which Dr. Patton seeks to establish, is as unsubstantial and baseless as a morning's dream. We will attend to the first section of his argument.

I. Dr. Patton sets out with the affirmation that "the doctrine of the restoration of all things comes to us with this suspicious mark upon its front, that it has never been the faith of the church of Christ." Certain individuals, he admits, and perhaps an heretical and mystical sect, may have favored the doctrine; "but nothing is more clear than that the church, as a body, has ever maintained the opposite view." He concedes that opinion cannot be settled by being put to vote. "The majority on a given point has often been wrong; the minority may be the wiser and better party. But the fact before us has to do with something besides numbers. It can support the verdict of the church by a three-fold consideration of great power."

1. "The majority in this case is not an ignorant, superstitious and morally debased majority against a learned, liberal and pure minority. It can abide any comparative test of learning, or piety, which may be applied to a certain quality as well as numbers."

2. "The value of this rejection" of the doctrine of the restoration by a majority of the church, "is increased by the fact that it is contrary to natural tendency." Parents, children, and pious souls would naturally incline to the larger view of the results of redemption; "yet the doctrine of restoration, although supported by natural feeling, and by many desires and sympathies in regenerate souls, has utterly failed to command the faith of the Christian church."

3. "More significant still," Dr. Patton continues, "is the relation of such a unity and permanence of church belief to the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit." He endeavors to dodge the doctrine of Papal Infallibility and church authority, as a consequence; but he maintains that "we are war-

ranted in understanding" the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit "to mean, *at least*, that the body of true believers, the succession of those regenerated by the Holy Spirit, shall be taught the truth as revealed in Scripture concerning the grand facts which constitute the working power of the Gospel on earth." "Can it be," he exclaims, "that the Holy Ghost has allowed almost the whole church to drift into error on this subject!"

And thus endeth the first lesson. We feel bound to confess that Dr. Patton has brought forth something new, if not strong and conclusive. We shall endeavor, without needless circumlocution, to return a fitting answer. We submit the following:

1. It is not true that the doctrine of the restoration of all souls "has never been the faith of the church of Christ." We mean this statement in its most literal and absolute sense. During the life-time of Christ and his apostles it was the dominant and all-prevailing faith of the church. The declarations of Christ with regard to the restoration of all souls, are so explicit that they leave no room for controversy. He deliberately affirmed that he came into the world to save the world, and language cannot be framed to assert more positively than he asserted that he would accomplish the purpose of his mission. We cannot be mistaken here. These are his words: "*And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me!*" We have never seen an "orthodox" explanation of these words that was worth a straw, or that would stand legitimate criticism a single moment. But Christ affirmed more than this. He affirmed that all men were given him of the Father, and that, ultimately, all shall come unto him, and no one be cast out. To the sceptical Sadducees he said that in the future life all men shall live unto God, shall die no more, and be equal unto the angels. All through the Gospels this sort of Messianic testimony runs, and it would seem that he must be blind indeed who cannot see that it points to one final result — the restoration of all souls.

2. The apostles, influenced by the Holy Spirit, were a unit with regard to the doctrine of the restoration. They knew no other doctrine. They preached no other. They left on record no other. Peter affirmed that God had spoken of "the restitution of all things, by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Paul affirmed that it was the purpose of God "to gather together in ONE all things IN CHRIST; both things which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him"; that God sent his Son "to reconcile all things to himself, whether they be things in heaven or things in earth"; that "all shall be made alive IN CHRIST," and that, ultimately, "GOD SHALL BE ALL IN ALL"! The apostle left no single line on record in contradiction of these statements; and when in near prospect of death, he rejoiced that he had "KEPT THE FAITH"! John, too, the great Revelator, was fully in unison with Paul. He tells us that he saw in vision "tears wiped from all faces"; that "there was no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, nor any more pain"; that He who sat upon the throne said: "BEHOLD, I MAKE ALL THINGS NEW"! Nothing, indeed, can be more wild and reckless than the assertion of Dr. Patton that the doctrine of the restoration of all souls "has never been the faith of the church of Christ." So far as we have any means of knowing, the doctrine of the restoration held unbroken sway from the beginning of Christ's ministry to the death of John. There is not one line to the contrary in the New Testament, nor in Church History pertaining to that period! If there be one line, let it, by all means, be produced!

3. And yet — we beg serious attention to the fact — the doctrine of endless punishment was then in the world. Indeed, it had long been in the world. But it was not the doctrine of Christ, nor of the apostles of Christ, nor was it in the church of Christ. Its sole advocates were Pharisaic Jews and unbelieving Pagans. It found its adherents chiefly among populations of men "lying in wickedness." The doctrine of the restoration never, for one moment, came into dispute among the apostles. They contended among themselves

about many things, but there was no contention among them touching the ultimate triumph of God, through Jesus Christ, in the salvation of the world. "He will have all men to be saved"; "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world," wrote the apostle to the Gentiles; and his statements met with no shadow of opposition from his brethren. Here, at least, they were a unit. At this point there was neither discussion, dissension nor revolt. From Christ to John all is clear. During that period the doctrine of endless punishment was wholly outside of the church of Christ, while at the same time, in that pure fold the doctrine of the restoration of all souls held unquestioned and uninterrupted sway.

4. Nor was the unity of the church broken with respect to this doctrine until many years after the death of John. The flood of Jewish and Pagan converts that swept into the church did not at once defile it. They brought with them, to be sure, their theological rags and tatters in abundance, but the corruption of the faith was at first imperceptible and very slow. Indeed, from A. D. 100 to A. D. 150, we find no trace, in the writings that remain to us of that period, of the doctrine of endless punishment. Belonging to that period we have the following Christian works: The First Epistle of Clemens Romanus; seven Epistles of Ignatius; The Epistle of Polycarp; The Epistle of Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas. No mention of endless punishment appears in either of these works. They are as silent as the grave with respect to that doctrine. The church was still a unit on the doctrine of the ultimate restoration. Fifty years after the death of John no person of prominence had appeared to assert the endlessness of sin and punishment. This is a significant fact. The church was, undoubtedly, growing more corrupt every day, but it had not yet reached a depth of corruption that would tolerate and fellowship so gross an error!

5. To the fifty years that succeeded the death of John, we now add forty years more, during which the doctrine of the restoration had no prominent Christian opponent. This carries us to A. D. 190. The works that have descended to us

from this period are the following: Sibylline Oracles; The Writings of Justin Martyr; A Relation of the Martyrdom of Polycarp; The Oration of Tatian; Two productions of Athenagoras; A Treatise of Theophilus; The Letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienna; and the Works of Irenæus. In these works a future judgment and a future state of punishment are alluded to, or asserted; but in none of them is the restoration of all souls denied. Several of the most eminent writers among them expressly assert that doctrine. The truth is, it was the prevalent faith; it was the orthodoxy of the church; and no person, of any position in the church, at that time, thought of denying it. But so far as Dr. Patton's statement is concerned, it is of little moment whether it was the faith of the church ten years or one hundred years; inasmuch as the facts do not sustain his assertion that "the doctrine of the restoration of all souls has never been the faith of the church of Christ." His assertion is false, and must be abandoned.

6. But we are now close upon the time when, by the permission of the Divine Providence, the doctrine of endless punishment was to enter the church, and confront the doctrine of the restoration. It is true that it was long in getting a foothold; but the time was at hand when the contest was to begin. Tertullian, a presbyter of Carthage, in Africa, a Pagan convert, was the first Christian writer — assuredly a very bad eminence — who expressly asserted the absolute endlessness of punishment. This was A. D. 200, or perhaps 204. As a dark, portentous storm-cloud is a fit reservoir of the devastating thunder-bolt, so Tertullian was a fit conduit of the devastating doctrine of endless woe. The following extract from his writings will give the reader a fair taste of his moral quality. Addressing the Pagans, he says:

"You are fond of your spectacles, but there are other spectacles. . . . How shall I admire, how laugh, how rejoice, how exult, when I behold so many kings and false gods in heaven, together with Jove himself, groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness; so many magistrates who persecuted the

name of the Lord, liquifying in fiercer flames than they ever kindled against Christians; so many sage philosophers blush-in raging fire, with their scholars whom they persuaded to despise God, and to disbelieve the resurrection; and so many poets shuddering before the tribunal, not of Radamanthus, not of Minos, but of the disbelieved Christ"!

Such was Tertullian, and to this savage and morose spirit must be accorded the honor of asserting, in the Christian Church, the eternity of future punishment. But the contagion spread slowly. It was not until A. D. 553 that Universalism was formally condemned. It took five hundred years of controversy and corruption to enthrone Paganism as orthodoxy in the church of Jesus Christ! And yet Dr. Patton, with unparalleled boldness, asserts that "the doctrine of the restoration of all souls was never the faith of the church of Christ"! Can assurance or ignorance go further?

7. But suppose the fact to be quite the reverse of what it really is; suppose it to be precisely what Dr. Patton would have us believe, viz., that the majority in the church has always been against the doctrine of the restoration, and that the majority is able to abide any comparative test of learning and piety; would that substantiate his argument based on a majority, and inure to the advantage of the doctrine of endless punishment? Not in the least. Consider the state of the contending parties at the close of Christ's ministry. On one side an immense majority, talent, learning, piety, and possession, which is "nine points of the law." On the other side a few very humble persons — fishermen, tent-makers, unlearned, ignorant, vulgar. No doubt the high priest at Jerusalem said: "This new doctrine comes to us with this suspicious mark upon its front, that it never has been the faith of the church of God. The majority is against it; and it is not an ignorant and besotted majority, but a majority that can stand any comparative test with respect to learning and morals. Christ must be an impudent innovator, and his doctrine untrue"! That men reasoned thus, with respect to Christ and Christianity, is very probable; and that Dr. Patton

would have reasoned thus, had he lived in that age, is something more than probable. The Greeks, who heard Paul at Athens, we presume dismissed the new doctrine with similar facility, and we would respectfully solicit Dr. Patton's attention to an application of his argument nearer home.

8. In Christendom the Protestant Church is a very decided minority; it numbers, perhaps, sixty million. The Roman Catholic Church claims over one hundred and sixty million. Now suppose a Catholic bishop should take up Dr. Patton's argument and apply it severely to the Protestant churches, thus: 1. Protestantism has never been the faith of the church of God. "The church as a body has ever maintained the opposite view." 2. "The majority in this case can abide any comparative test of learning and piety, as well as of numbers." 3. "The value of this rejection of Protestantism is increased by the fact that it is contrary to natural tendency." "Natural tendency" has always been opposed to authority, and in favor of the largest liberty; and yet Protestantism "has utterly failed to command the faith of the Christian church." 4. "Can it be that the Holy Ghost has allowed almost the entire church," until quite a recent period, "to abide in serious error on this solemn subject?" Fought thus with his own sword, what would Dr. Patton have to say in reply? He could have nothing to say that would bear the slightest logical scrutiny. The truth is, the Doctor has blown simply an argumentative bubble, which, pricked with even the smallest pin of logic, collapes instantly. The argument predicated upon majorities is really too shallow to be gravely indulged.

9. Nor is the auxiliary argument which he draws from what he styles "natural tendency" any better. He affirms that the value of the rejection of the doctrine of the restoration by a majority of the church "is increased by the fact that it is contrary to natural tendency." We suppose that Dr. Patton speaks with deep feeling here, and from the fulness of a personal experience. Two years ago, in his own newspaper, the *Advance*, he unveiled *his* "natural tendency"

in language most touching, and told his readers how he was oppressed by the doctrine of endless woe. He said:

"Do you imagine that only Universalists shudder at the idea of eternal ruin of lost souls? All thoughtful men share your dread of the fact, and would gladly reject the doctrine, if they honestly could. Nothing prevents me personally from welcoming the doctrine that all will finally be saved, but the want of evidence for it. The Orthodox generally have the same feeling. It pains us to think that so many of our fellow-men are living in sin and dying without hope. We have had neighbors, friends and dear relatives who have died giving no evidence of Christian character, but of quite the opposite; and we should be overjoyed to know that at last we should all meet above, holy and happy. *I frankly acknowledge that it would lift a dark cloud from the world, and a heavy load from my heart, could I believe your doctrine.*"

This, certainly, is genuine grief, and it commands our sympathy and pity. But the good man is not alone in his grief. A long-drawn sigh, a wail of woe, words heard through half-stifled sobs, rise from the most cultivated and refined souls throughout Christendom. Thousands are overshadowed and oppressed by the "dark cloud" and the "heavy load." Albert Barnes, Henry Ward Beecher and Dr. Patton are sad and prominent examples. And it should not escape attention that, the more refined, cultivated and Christ-like one is, the more certain is he to be oppressed by the "heavy load," and overshadowed by the "dark cloud" of endless torments. The lowest strata of society, the depraved and hardened, give little evidence of being similarly afflicted.

10. But is this peculiar affliction, this sorrowful wail against the doctrine of endless punishment, the result of purely "natural tendency"? We confidently answer, No! We fearlessly assert that, when following "natural tendency," men have never, in any considerable number, embraced the doctrine of the final salvation of all souls! The Egyptian, Greek and Roman theologies teem with endless hells, and swarm with innumerable devils! The more debased and enslaved a people, the darker any period of Christian history,

the more prevalent and absolute has been belief in malignant fiends, and unspeakably cruel eternal tortures. We challenge contradiction! "Left to themselves," says President Edwards, "and men have never progressed beyond the worship of stocks, stones and devils." How the case stands with respect to Pagan nations, past and present, need not here be rehearsed. Any one thoroughly acquainted with the history of the religions of the world will need no reminder. How the case stands in Christendom to-day, "orthodoxy" itself shall testify. The vilest men and women on earth to-day, are on the side of what Dr. Patton regards as "evangelical religion." Their belief in devils and hells is supremely "orthodox"! Theodore Tilton, a Congregationalist, and editor of the most widely-circulated "orthodox" newspaper in the world, affirms that—

"Nine-tenths of all 'the lewd fellows of the baser sort'—rowdies and ragamuffins, who use the sacred name of the Lord Jesus to point their profane oaths—have never entertained a sceptical doubt as to Christ's divinity. Nine-tenths of the inmates of our state prisons and county jails are thoroughly orthodox and evangelical in their belief. It is generally an Old School Presbyterian, or Roman Catholic, or some other extremely evangelical clergyman who is chosen by the sentenced murderer to accompany him to the scaffold."

Humiliating as this statement must be to our opponents, its truth cannot be successfully denied. The exigency of the argument, we are certain, was the only reason that induced Dr. Patton's statement touching "natural tendency." That he and other good men feel oppressed by the doctrine of endless punishment, is no good reason why he should regard himself as a fair specimen of the "natural tendency" of the rest of mankind. He and others are oppressed by the "heavy load" and the "dark cloud," because their "natural tendency" has been overcome by education and Christian culture, and their minds elevated to a high degree of intelligence and genuine Christian sympathy; and though "seeing through a glass darkly" at present, they feel, nevertheless,

the pressure of those ties by which God has bound together a creation that he "has made of one blood." Such men are scattered among the masses, everywhere. With respect to the whole truth, and God's true church, they are what Dr. Bushnell styles "outside saints." They have our entire sympathy. May God help them out of their difficulty, and bless their eyes, and cheer their hearts, with the light of the great truth, that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." Alas, that they should feel compelled to submit, for a single day, to dogmas and influences against which their education and whole soul revolts! May they speedily so far overcome their "natural tendency" as to find entire relief.

11. Having thus overturned the base of Dr. Patton's first argument, a word only need be indulged with regard to his assertion that the prevalence and domination of belief in endless misery, in the church of Christ, is due to some mysterious connection with Christ's promise to be with his disciples "alway," and to lead them into all truth. Dr. Patton evidently feels that, in making this assertion, he is trenching on Roman Catholic ground. It is amusing to see how gingerly he ventures upon it. He feels his way cautiously, and hedges with commendable prudence. He rejects "any enthusiastic or mystical appropriation of the promise by individuals, or an outward corporation," but maintains that we are warranted in understanding it "to mean, *at least*, that the body of true believers shall be taught the truth concerning the facts which constitute the working power of the Gospel on earth"; and he professes to be amazed that any one should believe "that the Holy Ghost has allowed almost the whole church to drift into error on this subject."

It is sufficient to reply, that the Holy Ghost has allowed the church of Christ to drift into error on other important subjects. The Holy Ghost has allowed the Catholic Church to "abide in serious error" on many important subjects, for at least fifteen centuries; and the Catholic Church is an immense majority to-day in Christendom. The Holy Ghost allowed the Presbyterian Church to "abide in serious error" for many

years touching the doctrine of the atonement; teaching that Christ died to reconcile God to man, instead of man to God! The Holy Ghost has allowed the entire Catholic Church, and a large majority of the Protestant Church, to "abide in serious error" with respect to the nature of future punishment; both parties teaching that the souls of God's children would be burned with fire, and submitted to the most savage material tortures, for the sins of the present life! It is absurd, in the last degree, for Dr. Patton to take shelter under this promise for the purpose of strengthening his argument against the "final restoration." The Holy Ghost is *gradually* leading the world into all truth; but we are not warranted in believing that the consummation will transpire until "every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." That the epoch is not far distant, so far as the generations of men upon the earth are concerned, we have abundant reason to believe; for sympathy with the doctrine of the final salvation of all souls is the strongest pulse that throbs to-day in the heart of Christendom.

II. Dr. Patton next affirms that it is "another unfavorable circumstance that the argument for a final restoration is based so largely on mere sentiment, or else on abstract philosophical argument concerning the divine character and government, sometimes called the principles of the Bible"; and he tells us that he "has been struck with the fact that, in the minds of many who advocate the doctrine, it seems to be an ebullition of feeling, rather than a careful exercise of judgment."

1. But, surely, Dr. Patton would not have us believe that he is entirely ignorant of Universalist literature, and that he wrote his article in utter disregard of the truth? And yet it is difficult to absolve him altogether from such a charge. Not a single Universalist book exists in which the argument is "largely based on mere sentiment." The leading books of the Universalist library are devoted, almost entirely, to expositions of Scripture and logical deductions therefrom. The manifestations of God in nature, and "the principles of honor and right," are made, of course, to contribute to the general

result; but appeals to the sentiments and feelings seldom occur. We mention here Balfour's Inquiries, Ballou on the Atonement, Rogers' Pro and Con, and Thayer's Theology of Universalism. We earnestly recommend Dr. Patton to read these books thoroughly; and if he does not find himself dealing with something besides "mere sentiment," or "an ebullition of feeling," we will cheerfully confess our mistake. The truth is, that while we hold in profound respect, and are instructed by the manifestations of God in nature, in the powers of the human mind, and the sentiments and intuitions of the soul, "the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion" and chief counsellor of Universalists. Let this be distinctly understood.

2. With respect to the "boundless perfections of God" implying ultimate holiness and happiness, and that "nothing else can satisfy the desire and manifest the glory of infinite love," Dr. Patton thinks "a difficulty lies in the fact that a Being of boundless purity should have allowed sin to cast even a shadow upon his universe"; in other words, that sin should have been permitted at all. It is not, he vehemently urges, "a question of time, or quantity, but of quality; it is a question of sin or no sin, that a holy, wise and omnipotent God is called on to decide; and not more or less sin, or longer or shorter sin." But, begging the Doctor's pardon for the flat contradiction, it is a question of time. Sin is here; and God is holy and good. And the question is a legitimate one: How long can a holy and good God, consistently with holiness and goodness, allow sin to remain? The answer is obvious: *Not a moment longer than is necessary for its removal.* Ought God to remove sin as soon as he possibly can? Yes; as soon as he can consistently with conditions necessarily involved in its removal. Have we reason to believe that God will effect the removal of sin? Yes; because he has sworn that he will; and because the principles of honor and right, and the best good of all his intelligent creatures, require it. The presence of sin and suffering now, is a poor apology for endless sin and suffering; and what reason perceives, the

Bible declares. "Weeping may endure for a night," says the Psalmist, "but joy cometh in the morning." The night of suffering and evil is temporary, and may be endured; for we know there is a radiant morning beyond. The Apostle Paul assures us that God chastises "for our profit, that we may be made partakers of his holiness." But wherein is the profit of endless punishment? Will it profit God? Will it profit angels? Will it profit the saved? Will it profit the damned? Will it profit devils? Edwards and others say it will profit the saved by increasing their happiness; but will any "orthodox" clergyman now agree to that? Is it difficult to see that though a parent may punish his child an hour, it is no reason why he should punish it a lifetime? It has been well said that "if an earthly father should torment a child to death, and attempt to justify it on such reasoning — that is, apply orthodox theology to human conduct — any earthly tribunal would consider him as weak as he was wicked!"

It is puerile to urge that we are too weak to judge of God, and therefore have no business to say what he ought or ought not to do. What is wicked in man, must be wicked in God. The principles of honor and right, says Dr. Beecher, God has implanted in our minds, and "he designed them as a divine disclosure to us of the principles by which he regulates his own conduct." The cry of mystery, and the assertion of incapacity, are defences the free, intelligent mind will never regard. God created us with our natural belongings, and he permits our surroundings; and the eternal principles of honor and right demand that he shall make the existence of every soul a blessing, and not a curse. Much may be permitted in the infancy of our being — in the first stage of our existence — everything necessary and honorable conceded to penalty in a just administration of government, but ultimate good to all concerned must issue as the final result. Dr. Beecher again well says: "A truly honorable mind cannot conceive of a higher good than that the God whom he loves and adores should fulfil to the highest degree of exactness every demand of honor and right to every created mind, however small.

No personal honor, no amount of encouragement, would bribe such a mind to be satisfied with a God who had disregarded the principles of honor to any one, even the least of all created minds. And it calls for a serious review of his opinions, if any one is conscious of ascribing to God acts which make him fear to admit this principle in its full extent."

3. The shift — sought to be strengthened by an utter perversion of the sentiments of Rev. T. Starr King — "that in the abuse of their freedom there may be souls who will persist forever in sin, and who will correspondingly suffer," is peculiarly unfortunate. Mr. King never made such an admission! We challenge proof. Endless sin and sinning is effectually barred by the fact that the worst of men, after almost a lifetime of sin, have repented and reformed. This is conclusive that there is nothing in sin itself that, necessarily, should bar the repentance and reformation of any sinner, at any time in his career, however vile he may be. The whole "orthodox" world recognizes this fact in the assertion that this life is one of probation, and that beyond this life the possibility of repentance and reformation does not exist; not because of any absolute hindrance on account of the nature of sin, but because of a Divine enactment. Dr. Patton is fully answered in this: Orthodox theologians have evidently felt compelled to thus put up the bars in order to prevent the sinner's return to God! If the law of character is sufficient to secure endless punishment, why should God trouble himself to enact a law barring the sinner's repentance and reformation after death? We feel quite sure that one or the other of these opinions will have to be given up.

4. We are astonished to find Dr. Patton — also under this head — denying the disciplinary nature of punishment. He says, "History fails to produce a single human government, from the beginning of time to the present, based on that idea, or a single legislator who advocated it." Very likely; but so much the worse for legislators and human governments. We are quite aware that the principle of most governments has been that of retaliation, and that revenge has ruled the hearts

and dictated the theories of many law-makers; but we fail to see in that fact a reason why we should conclude that the government of God is retaliatory and revengeful. When Dr. Patton asserts that "God nowhere in his Word affirms" that his punishments are disciplinary, we are led to conclude that his knowledge of the Bible is as limited as his knowledge of Universalist literature. We meet his assertion with a flat denial, and offer proof. "Ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh to you as unto *children* (they had sadly neglected to think of the paternal character of God); My SON, despise not the *chastening* of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him: for whom the Lord loveth he *chasteneth*, and scourgeth every SON whom he receiveth. If ye suffer chastening (*i. e.* punishment, the same word in the Greek), God dealeth with you as SONS; for where is there a son whom his father chasteneth not? For if ye be *without* chastisement, whereof *all* are partakers, then must ye be *bastards*, and not sons (*i. e.* must be the offspring of some other being). Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh who corrected us, *and we gave* them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection to the FATHER OF SPIRITS, and live! For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our PROFIT, *that we might be partakers of his holiness!* Now no chastening, *for the present*, seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless, AFTERWARD (there is an afterward to the Divine punishments, because they are disciplinary) it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness to them that are exercised thereby." Heb. xii. 5–11. This from the New Testament; and it declares the corrective nature of punishment, or it declares nothing. In numerous places in the Old Testament the same thing is affirmed: "My son, despise not the chastening of the Lord, neither be weary of his correction; for whom the Lord loveth he correcteth, *even as a father the son in whom he delighteth.*" Prov. iii. 11, 12. Indeed, the Bible is freighted with proof of the disciplinary nature of punishment in the government of God; and only cold-blooded Calvinism, it seems to us, can justify, as Dr. Patton does, the

"total and final expulsion" from the family of one who perseveres in doing wrong. For a parent to do that, he implies, would be just. But would *he*, totally and finally, expel a child of *his*, from *his* family, who had long persevered in doing wrong? Would he refuse admission to his most disobedient child, *on full evidence of repentance and reformation?* We are bold to answer for him — NEVER! Believer in endless punishment though he be, we say — NEVER! But suppose one of his children should be cast into hell, and subsequently repent and desire to ascend to heaven, but should find the way barred by God holding the door against him; what would Dr. Patton say to that? Suppose, furthermore, that God should compel that repentant and reformed child to be a devil's victim, and a companion of demons endlessly; would Dr. Patton find comfort in the reflection that God's punishments are not disciplinary? Would he exalt and glorify the Divine justice, goodness and benignity? Considerations such as these prick to the core the barbarous and horrid conceit that any government can be good, or any punishment just, that is not in its very nature reformatory, and wisely intended and administered to benefit and reclaim the erring. Endless punishment is vindictive, revengeful, and the very essence of cruelty; and when we have said that, we have said enough, and it may at once be dismissed as outside the pale of rational consideration.

III. We come now to Dr. Patton's third affirmation. He alleges "the vagueness of the professed Scripture evidence" of the restoration. "Direct evidence from Biblical assertion," he says, "is acknowledged to be scant." By whom acknowledged to be scant? By Hosea Ballou, Whittemore, Cobb, Thayer, Sawyer, Dr. Ballou — the leading supporters and defenders of Universalism in America? By men known as prominent Universalists, the world over? Not at all. Reference is made to the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Olshausen, Neander, and T. S. King. O fair-minded and disingenuous Dr. Patton! The first is an "orthodox" Quarterly; Olshausen and Neander were life-long Lutheran clergymen, with a Uni-

versalist bias; King was a Unitarian, of no theological pretension, and eminent only for goodness and splendid talent as a rhetorician and orator. But of Thomas Starr King a fact may as well be stated here plainly, that we may have done with further "orthodox" misrepresentations of his opinions, and the persistent pushing him forward into the theological field as an authority. The fact to which we refer is this: One day in company with Rev. J. S. Dennis, now of Chicago, Ill., Mr. King made the precise assertion quoted by Dr. Patton, viz.: "I do not find the ultimate salvation of all souls clearly stated in any text that has been reported from the lips of Christ." Said Mr. Dennis: "What do you think of this—'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me'?" Mr. King meditated for some time, and then answered: "*I think that does!*" Mr. King was a very young man at the time referred to, and had allied himself to a sect that professed to regard man's condition in the Future Life as but vaguely revealed. He was a faithful disciple of his new masters, and soon learned to talk of "principles," rather than of truths and facts. But of the New Testament he said: "All the principles glow there, as vivid as sunlight, that are required to give us the most consoling trust in God through eternity, and the most cheering hope for man."

If Dr. Patton really desired to deal honorably with Universalism, he would have quoted from leading Universalist authors and presented their views of our Scriptural evidence, instead of quoting other men who were not of us, and on their authority pronouncing our evidence vague. We conclude, as we have already intimated, that Dr. Patton is exceedingly ignorant of Universalist literature. He quotes and reviews seven passages of Scripture, on which he assumes we chiefly rely—just seven, all told! Mr. Whittemore, in his *Plain Guide*, under the head—"What evidences do Universalists adduce from the Scriptures of the eventual holiness and happiness of all men?"—quotes and comments on *one hundred texts!* Victor Wilson, in his *Reasons for our Hope*

quotes *one thousand!* Dr. Patton, of Chicago, solemnly pronouncing our Scriptural evidence vague, quotes just seven! If we were reviewing, under similar circumstances, the doctrine of endless punishment, we would candidly say, Orthodox theologians claim that the Scripture evidence in support of this doctrine is very abundant and very direct; but our space will not allow of a review of more than six or seven passages. We will endeavor to select those upon which they most depend. We judge that would be fair and honest; and we do not see how, short of that, we could "preserve a conscience void of offence." But we will examine, in brief, his seven famous texts.

1. Dr. Patton first comments on Rom. xi. 32: "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." He thinks this is only an assertion of the possibility of salvation of both Jew and Gentile. But we are confident that this is far short of the apostle's meaning. In the first verse of this chapter Paul asks: "Hath God cast away his people?" He exclaims: "God forbid!" At the fifteenth verse he further inquires: "If the casting away of them BE THE RECONCILING OF THE WORLD (*i. e.* one of the means of reconciling the world), what shall the RECEIVING of them be, but life from the dead?" At the twenty-fifth verse he explains what had hitherto been a mystery: "For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits, that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the FULNESS of the Gentiles be come in; and so ALL ISRAEL SHALL BE SAVED." And the apostle concludes with these remarkable words: "For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are ALL THINGS; to whom be glory forever. Amen!" As Dr. Whitby says: "For of him (as the donor), and through him (as the director and providential orderer), and to him (as the end), are all things." Mr. Whittemore well inquires: "What serious man can pretend that by the fulness of the Gentiles he meant only a portion of them? And by all Israel he meant only a small part of Israel?" Was it such a view that led Paul to exclaim, at

the conclusion of his luminous argument, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God"? The idea is absurd. Rom. xi. 32, with its connections, must stand as an unanswerable Scriptural evidence of Universalism.

2. Dr. Patton next introduces the fifth chapter of Romans, and quoting verses 15, 17, 21, remarks: "It may be candidly admitted, that if we had no other instruction in the Bible respecting the final results of the redemptive scheme, a ground of hope might be afforded, by these expressions, of a universal salvation." He concludes, however, that there are "explicit declarations of Scripture to the contrary"; that a "conditional nature is ascribed to salvation by Christ"; that we appropriate Adam's transgression by voluntary lives of sin, and that there "must be a similar appropriation of the redemption through Christ." To which we reply: 1. Dr. Taylor, as quoted by Dr. Clarke, says the argument of the apostle stands thus: "The consequences of Christ's obedience extend as far as the consequences of Adam's disobedience. The consequences of Adam's disobedience extend to ALL MANKIND; and, therefore, so do the consequences of Christ's obedience." This is "orthodox" authority. 2. What are the consequences of Christ's obedience? We are pained to observe that Dr. Patton carefully passes over verse 19: "For as by one man's disobedience many (*οἱ πολλοί*, *the many*) were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many (*οἱ πολλοί*) be made righteous." And this is the pivotal verse of this chapter. Parkhurst says: "*οἱ πολλοί*, the many, *i. e.* the multitude, or whole bulk of mankind." Dr. Macknight, also "orthodox," says: "For as *the many*, in the first part of the verse, does not mean some of mankind only, but all mankind, from first to last, who without exception are constituted sinners, so *the many* in the latter part of the verse, who are said to be constituted righteous, through the obedience of Christ, must mean ALL MANKIND, from the beginning to the end of the world, WITHOUT EXCEPTION." Dr. Clarke, another "orthodox" authority, says of the same phrase, in verse 15: "That the *οἱ πολλοί*, *the many*, of the apostle, here means all

mankind needs no proof to any but that person who finds himself qualified to deny that all men are mortal." With these authorities we leave Dr. Patton to do battle. 3. That the authors we have quoted believed in endless punishment, may be explained on the ground that critics and commentators often give utterance to truths the extent and importance of which they do not always clearly perceive. Sometimes, too, they are so fully possessed, overwhelmed and carried away with the truth, that, for a season, they lose self-control, and speak and write as they are moved by the Holy Ghost. We must believe that this was the case with Dr. Adam Clarke, when he wrote his comment on the last verse of this chapter. We accept his words with all our heart: "Thus we find that salvation from sin here is as extensive as the guilt and contamination of sin; death is conquered, hell disappointed, the devil confounded, and SIN TOTALLY DESTROYED! Amen! Hallelujah! The Lord God omnipotent reigneth! Amen, and Amen."

3. Dr. Patton next examines 1 Cor. xv. 22: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." He acknowledges "that the two 'alls' correspond, and refer to the whole human race"; but he maintains that being made alive in Christ means simply "a bodily resurrection through Christ." This is very weak. Paul flatly contradicts the notion of a "bodily resurrection," or a resurrection of the body, in verse 37: "And that which thou sowest, THOU SOWEST NOT THE BODY THAT SHALL BE." The notion, too, that Paul's object in this chapter was to "comfort the saints," is refuted by the terms of universality with which it abounds. Dr. Patton says that he would be greatly comforted, and a "heavy load" lifted from his heart, and "a dark cloud from the world," could he believe that all at last should meet above, and be holy and happy. In this view of the case, it might, perhaps, be admitted that Paul wrote to comfort saints; at any rate, his statements are a conclusive revelation of what Dr. Patton, and all good men, as he tells us, greatly desire. But he sadly fails, as we believe, to grasp the apostle's meaning in the statement that all shall be made alive in

Christ; and yet, if we be not greatly mistaken, his meaning is plain. By saying that all men shall be made alive IN Christ, he intended to assert that IN Christ all shall be new creatures: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a NEW CREATURE." 2 Cor. v. 17. If any man be in Christ *now*, he is a new creature; and if any man be in Christ at any time, present or future, he shall be a new creature. Nor is this all. The Scriptures assert that, "There is no condemnation to those who are IN Christ Jesus." Rom. viii. 1. And this new life "IN Christ," they affirm, is eternal life: "And this is the record, that God hath given us eternal life, and that life is IN his Son." 1 John v. 11. And that blessed state, we are assured, shall be without end: "Who (Christ) is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless (ἀκατάλυτου) life." Heb. vii. 16. The sum of the apostle's statement, then, is this: 1. To be in Christ is to be a new creature. 2. There is no condemnation in Christ. 3. Eternal life is in Christ. 4. All mankind shall be made alive (*i. e.* receive a new spiritual estate) in Christ. This is "the restoration of all men." This is Universalism. And yet this portion of 1 Cor. xv. is but a fragment from that great Iliad of Universal Redemption. The chapter is a symmetrical whole; bound and compacted together in all its parts; through which burns the ultimate glory, and throbs free and regnant the story, of a lapsed universe restored and reconciled to God!

4. But we hasten. "A weak argument," Dr. Patton says, "is derived from 1 Tim. ii. 4: 'Who will have all men to be saved, and come unto a knowledge of the truth.'" But he assures us that these words do not refer to God's "decretive will," but "to his benevolent will, or desire." Will Dr. Patton be kind enough to tell us how that assumption, if conceded, will inure to the benefit of "orthodoxy"? Is God's desire something essentially different from his will? Does he desire anything he does not will? How can desire and will, in an infinitely perfect being, be unlike? What sort of a spectacle would God present, if willing one thing and desir-

ing another? Certainly he would appear weak, and imbecile, to the last degree. It is of little consequence to us, so far as the result is concerned, which way the text is read; for we are assured that "He *doeth* his WILL in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth," Dan. iv. 35; and that "What his soul *desireth*, even THAT HE DOETH." Job xxiii. 13. When God says he "WILL HAVE" all men to be saved, it seems blasphemous to deny that he will keep his word! It has been well said, that He "who openeth his hand and satisfieth the desire of every living thing," Psa. cxlv. 16, will certainly so arrange as to satisfy his own!

5. Phil. ii. 9–11 is dismissed with the merest notice. The apostle asserts that unto Christ Jesus "every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Dr. Patton thinks "that it is not a willing acknowledgement that is here spoken of." Devils, he says, believe and tremble. They did so, he assures us, when Jesus was on earth. But we cannot allow Dr. Patton to set aside this important proof-text so easily. What proof has he that it is not a willing acknowledgment that is spoken of here? He refers to Isaiah xlv. 23. But this is fatal to his theory. The passage in Isaiah reads thus: "I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear, surely shall say, *in the Lord have I righteousness and strength.*" This annihilates the theory of a forced acknowledgment. If the acknowledgment be true, it cannot be a forced acknowledgment; if it be false, then we must accept the startling conclusion that Jehovah will make himself party to a falsehood! The foisting in of the word "*one*," by the translators, deserves severe reproof. It is nothing less than "handling the Word of God deceitfully." The "orthodox" Barnes is more accurate and generous. He thus renders verse 24: "Truly in Jehovah shall *men* say, is *their* righteousness and strength." Inasmuch as Dr. Patton admits that Phil. ii. 9–11

refers to all men, living and dead, and refers to Isaiah xlv. 23 as parallel, he unconsciously, but truly, makes an unanswerable argument for universal salvation! Lange, to whom he seems fond of referring, says of Phil. ii. 9–11, that it "comprises the entire realm of worshipping creatures"; and the confession, he says, means "the eloquent homage breaking forth from the heart and confessing itself to him." Dr. Clarke says that, "By confessing him to be Lord we may understand that WORSHIP which all intelligent creatures are called to pay to God." Professor Stuart says: "What can be meant by things in heaven bowing the knee to Jesus, if spiritual worship be not?" And, referring to Rev. v. 13, where, in similar phrase, the whole creation is represented as praising God, he says: "If this be not spiritual worship, . . . I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine." So far as Dr. Patton is concerned, this, for the present, will do. Unless something better and more conclusive be offered, this great proof-text must be forever regarded as a gracious and merciful revelation that all men shall finally be saved.

6. Of Acts iii. 20, 21, but a word need be said: "Whom the heavens must receive, until the time of the restitution of all things, which God has spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Dr. Patton thinks that this "simply imports the final victory of Christ over Satanic opposition, and the renewal of earth's allegiance to her rightful King." But against this puerile criticism we will set the opinion of Dr. Clarke. He says: "As the grace of the Gospel was intended to destroy the reign of sin, its energetic influence is represented as restoring all things, destroying the bad state and establishing the good. . . . This is done in every believing soul; all things are restored to their primitive order, and the peace of God which passeth all understanding, keeps the heart and mind in the knowledge and love of God. . . . And when such a work becomes UNIVERSAL, as the Scriptures intimate it will, THEN ALL THINGS WILL BE RESTORED IN THE FULLEST SENSE OF THE TERM." Dr. Clarke, undoubt-

edly, here caught a glimpse of the apostle's meaning. The apostle's words are but an echo of the great promise of our Saviour: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." What is said about "Satanic opposition," the "second coming of Christ," "crushing foes," etc., may, until proven, be dismissed as a gratuitous and groundless assumption; which a strong man, defending a strong cause, would never indulge.

7. One more text, and Dr. Patton closes this section of his attack. He says our chief reliance is on Col. i. 19, 20: "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." Neander said of this (Planting, &c., B. vi. cap. I.), "This passage we shall interpret in the simplest and most natural manner, if we can admit such a reference to the reconciling and redeeming work of Christ on the fallen spiritual world. . . . A magnificent prospect is thus presented of the final triumph of the work of redemption, which was first opened to the mind of the great apostle in the last stage of his Christian development, by means of that love which impelled him to sacrifice himself for the salvation of mankind." Ellicot also says: "This, and no less than this, it *does* say, that the eternal and incarnate Son is the *causa medians* by which the absolute totality of created things shall be restored to its primal harmony with its Creator." Citing these authorities, with disapproval, "let us more boldly face the question," says Dr. Patton; and forthwith he proceeds to indulge in several glaring assumptions, to wit: First, "To affirm here universal restoration is to flatly contradict a hundred explicit passages which teach the final perdition of impenitent men." Second, "It may be suggested that the alleged universality of the language is, after all, limited to the earth and heaven, and does not include the devil and his angels." Third, "Less contradiction to other portions of Scripture would be found in interpreting this passage on the annihilation theory." Fourth, "Paul is not speaking

of heaven and earth as a mass of individuals, every one of whom is declared to have been reconciled . . . but of the organic universe, as such, the instituted kingdom of God." "Of this organic unity hell makes no part. Lost men and angels are outside of the *kosmos*. They are stricken from the roll. They are convicts in prison. They are the dogs outside of the New Jerusalem."

Beyond these assumptions Dr. Patton has nothing to offer. But in behalf of decency and dignity, we protest against such undignified wriggling out of an unpleasant difficulty. Does not Dr. Patton know well enough that his assumptions here are without a particle of proof, and that his criticism is not worth a straw? From either of these refuges on which he may choose to take a stand, he can be easily and effectually driven. We answer him thus: 1st. He confesses that the passage under consideration "is entirely parallel with Eph. i. 10." Lange says of the latter: "It is altogether unmistakable that, in accordance with the views in this Epistle, as well as the entire organism of Scripture truth, we must apply this to the TOTALITY OF THE CREATION." And he refers to Olshausen and others. 2d. That the phrase "all things" here means all mankind, the context proves: "For by him were ALL THINGS created . . . ALL THINGS were created by him and for him. And he is before ALL THINGS, and by him ALL THINGS consist . . . that in ALL THINGS he might have the preëminence . . . to reconcile ALL THINGS to himself, whether they be things in heaven or things in earth, even in him." In these remarkable verses the phrase "all things" is used five times; and who will venture to say that the "totality of the creation" is not meant? 3d. In 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, we read: "ALL THINGS are of God, who *hath* reconciled us (believers) to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given us the ministry of reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ RECONCILING THE WORLD ("all things") unto himself." Here believers are spoken of as having been reconciled, and a sinful world as being in process of reconciliation. 4th. Moreover, reconciliation implies an unreconciled party,

and the apostle affirms that reconciliation shall be coëxtensive with unreconciliation. The "dogs," the "convicts," as Dr. Patton styles them, are the very persons, and the only persons, who need to be reconciled. Already the Gospel had reconciled sundry Colossian "dogs" and "convicts"; for the apostle adds: "And *you* who were sometimes alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled." Can there be a shadow of doubt here, that the apostle meant to affirm that, through Jesus Christ, the restoration and reconciliation of the entire human family shall ultimately transpire? And this conclusion would be in strict harmony with what he wrote to the Corinthians — 1 Cor. xv. 28: "And when ALL THINGS shall be subdued to him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put ALL THINGS under him, that God may be ALL IN ALL." If there be a hope dear to the heart of man, for which God's Word gives justification, it is the hope that, "in the dispensation of the fulness of times," as says John Wesley (Sermons, Vol. v. p. 156), "the whole race of mankind shall know, and love, and serve God, and reign with him forever and ever."

IV. The doctrine of endless misery is absolutely without proof. The two texts upon which Dr. Patton plants himself will sufficiently illustrate this statement. The first is the inevitable Matt. xxv. 46: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." "Immense efforts," he says, "have been made, by men learned and unlearned, to show that 'everlasting' in this passage means only of long duration; but the literal and natural sense is sustained by these five considerations: First, The use of the same Greek *word*, in the same sentence, to denote the eternal life of the righteous."[1] To which we reply that the

[1] Two facts, not generally understood, but quite conclusive, deserve here prominent mention: 1. The word *aionios* is also used twice in Hab. iii. 6, in the translation of the LXX., and in each instance with a different meaning. It is applied to the hills in one instance, and in the other to the ways of the Almighty. The use of a word twice in the same sentence, therefore, does not necessarily imply that in each instance it has the same meaning. Nothing is more common in Scripture than the use of the same word, in the same or adjoining verses, with a varying or different sense. There is a fine example of this in Matt. viii. 22: "Let the dead bury their dead." The meaning

phrase used to describe the punishment of the wicked, and the happiness of the righteous, in the same sentence, is not the same phrase. This fact, as we shall soon see, is important. The phrase applied to punishment is *κολασις αἰώνιον*; the phrase applied to happiness is *ζωὴν αἰωνιον*. The word *kolasis* describes the nature of the punishment of the wicked, its intention, its purport, and, of necessity, fixes the meaning of *aionion*. The *Synonyms of the New Testament*, by the present Archbishop of Dublin, p. 30, has this very important passage: "Of the two words *timoria* and *kolasis*, in *timoria*, according to its classical use, the vindictive character of punishment is the predominant thought. . . . In *kolasis*, on the other hand, *is more the notion of punishment as it has reference to the correction and bettering of him that endures it!*" And the Archbishop quotes Philo, Plato, Clement of Alexandria, and others, as authorities for these definitions. Now, then, it is indubitable that corrective punishment cannot be

here of the word dead cannot be the same in each case. There is another instance in which *aionios* is used twice, and, undeniably, in each case in a different sense. Rom xvi. 25, 26: "Since the world began," is, in the original, *chronois aioniois;* "Of the everlasting God," it is, *tou aioniou Theou.* No one, we are confident, will venture to say that, in these two places, *aionios* has the same meaning. This, of course, is conclusive of the controversy with respect to Matt. xxv. 46.

2. But there is another fact, also bearing conclusively on Matt. xxv. 46. We find it elaborately stated in an English work entitled "The Friendly Disputants." The fact is this: The Greeks had two terms, *ploce* and *antanaclasis*, for the repetition of the same word, but with a diversity of sense, in the same or adjoining sentence; and it is not to be supposed that they named, and treated of, a thing that had no existence in their language and literature. In fact, we find it in all languages, ancient and modern, particularly the former, and in great variety. Our English would not be amiss were we to say of an unhappy attempt at criticism, "Some of the remarks betray partial learning, others the partial mind." In this sentence, the similarity of form between which and the verse under consideration is evident, *partial* has two meanings, being in one combination opposed to *complete*, and in the other to *unbiased*. We could easily say, "He has a handsome stud and equipage," but one would scarcely say, "He has a handsome face and fortune." It would be more natural to say, "He has a handsome face and a handsome fortune." We can either say, "The house is handsome, and the furniture is handsome," or we might express the adjective only once, and say, "The house and furniture are handsome." As handsome is here used in both cases in the same sense, according to the Greek idiom we can only say, "The house and furniture are handsome." So in Matt. xxv. 46, if the meaning were the same in both cases we should have had *aionios* but once — assuming, according to the usual doctrine, that duration of time is the main idea of the passage — and have read thus: "These shall go into punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

endless; and, therefore, the word *aionion*, in connection with *kolasis*, does not assert endless punishment. Indeed it asserts nothing with respect to duration of time. Nor does the phrase *zoen aionion*. We challenge Dr. Patton to prove that the word everlasting, by its own force, expresses duration at all; that in a single instance its meaning is not wholly derived from the nature of the subject to which it is applied. When it is applied to God, it takes the sense of endless; but not because of anything inherent in itself, but because God is endless. When it is applied to the gates of Jerusalem, it takes the sense of limitation, because of the nature of the gates. When it is applied to punishment, its meaning is limited, because of the nature of punishment. And God has hedged up this fact by employing the word *kolasis;* which as clearly determines the duration of *aionion*, as do the words God, gates, covenant, etc., to which it is elsewhere attached. — Dr. Patton's second reason is, "the concurrence of other texts with varied language expressing the same idea." But these he fails to produce. If there were such texts, he certainly would have quoted, at least, a single specimen. His reticence is, undoubtedly, judicious! — His third consideration is, "that the sentence is pronounced at the general judgment, which closes earthly history; beyond which we have no further revelations as to the wicked." This is an assumption, which he very well knows Universalists deny; but he attempts no proof. — His fourth consideration is, "that the words were addressed to those who believed in the doctrine of endless punishment, as Josephus and other authors testify." The words were addressed by Christ to his disciples, who were not believers in endless punishment. If Josephus and others testify that they were, we are bold to say that they knew nothing about it, and testified to what was not true. — His fifth and last consideration is, "the constant use of the word *aionios* in the New Testament to denote strict eternity." "It occurs," he says, "seventy-one times, in sixty-one of which it means literally endless." We reply that in forty-one instances it is associated with life, and is of indefinite duration — referring

to quality rather than quantity. Believers are represented as *having* eternal life. "He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life." John iii. 36. But the possibility of "falling from grace" and losing "eternal life," we presume, will not be denied. It is a very specific quality, but a very indefinite quantity. Specifically, "life eternal" is a knowledge of the only true God and Jesus Christ his Son: "And *this* is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John xvii. 3. It lasts during the existence of faith in the soul of the believer; but no longer. In the instances remaining, αἰώνιος is seven times applied to punishment; but the nature of the subject limits its meaning to an indefinite period. In other instances it is applied to things that in their nature are endless, and that fact, of course, precludes all doubt as to its meaning. If Dr. Patton, or any one else, can prove that there is something in the nature of punishment that necessarily makes it eternal in duration, as there is in the nature of God, a point would be gained, we confess, for the doctrine of endless punishment; but the gain, we fancy, would be immensely inconvenient, and orthodoxy would be perpetually troubled with the question — "What shall we do with it?" For if αἰώνιος means as much when applied to punishment as when it is applied to God, it would follow that punishment always has existed, as certainly as that it always will exist!

The second text, to which specific reference is made, is Mark iii. 29, in which occurs the phrase "eternal damnation." In the Sinaitic MS. the phrase, Dr. Patton assures us, is "eternal sin" — αἰώνιον ἁμαρτήματος — and that this version is accepted as correct by the best authorities. As he undoubtedly quoted from Lange, why did he omit to quote the following statement: "The readings κρίσεως and κολάσεως seem to have been explanatory paraphrases of this pregnant expression"? Moreover, on Matt. xii. 32, Lange quotes with approbation the following from De Wette, and refers to Wetstein, and to Chrysostom: "To declare from it (the phrase touching the sin against the Holy Ghost) the strict eternity of

future punishment, we would require to take the words of Jesus in their strict eternity, while *they are evidently a proverbial expression!*" With De Wette agree Grotius, Bishop Newton and Dr. Clarke. "The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from ALL sin." 1 John i. 7. And is it at all probable that he who has commanded us to forgive, "not until seven times, but until seventy times seven," intended to say that there is one sin that our Father in heaven will protect and shield with his displeasure eternally? We say with Dr. Clarke: "Every sin may be repented of (and, of course, forgiven) under the Gospel dispensation."

Thus fades out and vanishes the last support Dr. Patton can find for endless punishment. To be sure, there is a use of certain phrases, such as "worm dieth not," "unquenchable fire," "whose end is to be burned," etc., etc.; but it is only the murmur of the storm bereft of its bolt and its danger, and dying away in the distance — a prelude, we trust, to brighter skies, a purer atmosphere, and perpetual joy and peace.

V. This brings us to the end. The article we have reviewed is remarkable, in about equal proportions, for its damaging admissions, its ingenuity, its astonishing boldness, and the utter weakness of its attack and defence. But the truth is the historical argument for Universalism is unanswerable; the Bible argument irrefutable; the rational argument convincing; while the doctrine of endless punishment, as we have demonstrated, is utterly without one of these supports. It is dying daily; and when it is dead, we rejoice to believe, with Dr. Patton, that a "heavy load" will be lifted from human hearts, and "a dark cloud from the world." How, then, can Universalism, as he urges finally, be injurious in its tendency and results? He thinks that such men as Neander, Oberlin and Foster may believe and escape injury; but that "there is a class below which must speedily receive serious injury from the prevalence of such opinions." But, in the name of common sense, how can "the class below" — the scoundrels and blackguards, the tenants of prisons and brothels, who believe,

almost without exception, in endless punishment, be injuriously affected, as to morals, by a change of faith! Any change, it would seem, must be for the better. We are thoroughly convinced that Universalism, heartily believed, would reform and save them. It would develop their manhood and womanhood by impressing them with the fact that they are capable of better things, and that there is something yet in them to build on; that God is their Father, and loves them, and always will; that punishment is certain, and that a good life is the only sure road to happiness and peace. Let the experiment be tried. Few recruits does the devil get from the ranks of Universalists and Unitarians. When Dr. Patton confesses that it will take "successive generations to see the full effect of disbelief in eternal punishment," he confesses judgment against himself, and virtually abandons his case. But when he declares, as he does in his final sentence, "Let it be generally believed that heaven is sure to every man at last, and the flood-gates of sin will be wide open," we tell him that he is simply hanging out a scarecrow that will frighten nobody! The character of Universalists and Unitarians is too well known to be injuriously affected by such an absurd and stupid assertion.

Article X.

Mystery and Religion.

Some one has said that "where mystery begins, religion ends"; and another has said that "though this is a pithy remark, it is yet pithily false." Mystery does not destroy faith or crush the aspirations of the soul that is animated and vitalized by religion. The reverse of this is true. It is the mystery of life, of time and eternity, that makes religion a necessity. Though not confined to what is mysterious, but entering into and presiding over all the concerns of practical

life, it does not desert us when these fail. When, shrinking and afraid, we gaze out into the darkness of the future, both of this world and the next, and vainly endeavor to descry some safe pathway bridging over the unknown, religion stands by us, and bids us lean on a Father's arm and press fearlessly onward.

Were it true that where mystery begins religion must end, religion never would begin. Mystery is everywhere, and confronts us at every step. Life itself is a mystery, impenetrable, inscrutable, and not to be solved by any analysis. Not an object that meets our eyes, whether living or inanimate, but conceals mysteries too profound for the human intellect, in all the pride of its research, to dissipate. We boast of the wonderful discoveries of modern science. We would not certainly undervalue its achievements. They who by these researches have done so much for human welfare in giving to practical men control over the forces of nature, are worthy to be enrolled among the greatest of human benefactors. And yet, conceding this, how comparatively few the mysteries they have really solved. They have only discovered a few secondary causes, and learned the laws by which these secondary causes act. The real causes of the phenomena of nature lie to-day as far beyond the reach of human penetration as ever before.

Sir Isaac Newton, sitting one day under a tree, saw an apple fall. Because the occurrence was so common and insignificant, other minds would have let it pass unnoticed. But Newton asked himself why it went to the ground, rather than upward into the skies. The inquiry thus suggested was followed up, till he discovered the law of universal gravitation. The school-boy of to-day is ready to tell us why it is that unsupported bodies fall, instead of rising. Ask him what it is that keeps the earth and the planets in their places, and causes them to move with so much regularity and harmony through the heavens, and he replies that it is the attraction of the sun. But what is gravitation? No one can tell what it is, or why it acts with such uniformity. He may dis-

sect the earth to the last grain of sand, but he cannot find it. It eludes alike the sight and touch, and no analysis is so subtle as to detect its presence. The mystery of gravitation never has been, and never will be, solved, though it exists everywhere, in the largest and the smallest bodies alike, and equally in the earth as in the heavens. Newton made no progress towards its solution, and only to Him who created all things, is it, or ever will it be, known. It is so everywhere. With all our pride of learning, we know nothing of real causes. We may talk wisely and use many scientific terms, but a step will lead us where impenetrable darkness reigns.

We look out upon the world, and two classes of objects meet the eye. The one class comprises dead and inorganic forms, and the other the infinitely varied forms of organic life. These give to the face of nature its beauty. But for its vegetation the earth would have but a dreary look. The carpet of green which stretches away on every hand far as the eye can reach, with its infinite and ever-changing variety of grass and flower, and shrub and tree, waving in the breeze, turns desolation to beauty and fills the soul with visions of loveliness. And these forms enshrine a principle not found in the rock, the earth, or the waters. They are organic bodies, proceeding from germs hidden in the earth and springing up out of its nurturing bosom. Who can tell what that principle is? Men have searched for it in vain. The botanist may dissect the flower to its minutest parts, and the chemist may gather up the scattered stalks and leaves, and distil them in his crucible in search of their constituent elements, and perhaps he may find them; but the life of the vegetable or the flower he can never find. Impalpable, invisible and imponderable, the skill of science is exhausted in vain to detect it. Only He who, breathing upon these forms, gave them life, can tell what that life is.

We pass from the vegetable to the animal world, and the mystery is enhanced. If possible, the variety is greater. Naturalists find no end to the species of living creatures.

Every year brings to light those before unknown, and the time never will probably come when it will be said, "There are no more!" The earth, on its surface and beneath its soil; the waters, in its brooks and rivers, its pools and lakes and oceans; and the very air we breathe, are alike crowded with living creatures, which in variety of shape, color and organization, are infinite. From the animalcula that crowd by thousands a drop of water, up to those vast forms, the monsters of the mighty deep; from the minutest insect with tiny wing, up to the bird that gazes with unflinching eye into the very beams of the sun; and from the smallest quadruped, up to the huge pachyderms that roll their heavy forms over African and Asiatic plains, there is a variety no man can number. It is an easy thing, by the aid of books, to assort and arrange them, and tell the classes to which they all belong. We can talk learnedly of species, genera and orders, and use many uncouth technical terms, and we may, therefore, perhaps, think we know a great deal. But a single step brings us to depths we cannot fathom. There is that which we call life — the animating principle of these multitudes of creatures — of this we are compelled to acknowledge that after all our researches, we know absolutely nothing. Anatomy and physiology alike fail to reveal it, and they who have spent their lives in these studies, know as little of its essence as the smallest child.

Passing from the brute creation to human beings, the mystery is for us by no means lessened. A philosopher of ancient times enunciated a maxim which has survived the waste of ages and made his name immortal. So important did he regard it, that he caused it to be written over the portal of a temple, that people might be reminded of it as they went to their devotions. "Know thyself," was the formula by which he thus sought to lead men into all wisdom. We recognize the value of the precept, and wish it were everywhere heeded. We cannot know ourselves too well. In many ways better than now may we attain to such knowledge. "Know thyself" may be said to us all, and the injunction, if obeyed, would lead us into the way of wisdom.

But how little do we know of ourselves. How little comparatively can one know of himself. Surrounded as he is by mysteries, man is yet a greater mystery to himself. In his physical nature, he is like all other creatures, curiously, wonderfully and mysteriously made. His conception and birth are a mystery. His growth is a mystery. Nutrition, supplying the daily waste of the body, is a mystery. His ability to endure the extremes of heat and cold is a mystery. The act of breathing, and the pulsations of the heart, are mysteries. Ten thousand questions may be asked respecting his complicated physical organization, and its delicate and wonderful machinery, which no man can answer. And then, when middle age is reached, and the powers of life begin to fail, the change brings to view another class of mysteries, which are connected with decay and death. Very thoughtless must he be, who can stand in the presence of death, and view a form once animated with life, but now cold and motionless, without the deepest emotions of wonder and fear. Fearfully and wonderfully are we made. Darkness sits upon our origin; it goes with us at every step in life, and when death comes the darkness covers all that remains.

Science has done much towards making known to us the complicated mechanism of our physical frames. The anatomists have analyzed these bodies of ours, and know every joint, process, muscle, tendon, fibre and nerve, and can tell how all conspire to give perfection to the movements of the physical man. Anatomical and medical science has been greatly improved since the days when medicine and witchcraft were synonymous terms. Had the intelligence of the people kept pace with this progress in the curative art, much would have been done for the removing of the impositions which in various forms wring from the hands of toil the money they can ill afford to spare, for advertised, patented and worthless nostrums. But with all this progress thus made in the knowledge of the human frame, how little is its mystery removed. Who of the most learned of the medical profession can solve the mystery of physical life? Those who know the most, the

most readily acknowledge their ignorance concerning it. While they can tell all about the machinery of the human frame, of the hidden force which animates it they know absolutely nothing.

We pass from man's physical to his intellectual nature, but to find deeper mysteries still. Man is not merely an animal. He acts not from instinct and impulse alone, but also from conviction. He thinks and wills, remembers and reasons, loves and hates, anticipates and fears. Here we find a point of departure between him and the lower orders of creatures, a rising upward in the gradation of being, to higher planes. In proportion to the superiority, the deeper the mysteries. We think; but who can tell what it is to think? We will; but who ever yet has solved the mystery of the will? The question of its freedom, and whether it acts from motives in all cases, and if so, whether it can determine the motives by which it will be swayed, has never yet been satisfactorily solved. Metaphysicians have reasoned and written, and settled it often to their own satisfaction; but it will, nevertheless, come up and be agitated anew, whenever any new aspirant for metaphysical fame appears upon the stage. Humbly we express the conviction it never will be finally disposed of. To bridge over the mighty chasm which separates the human from the divine agency, and to tell how the one may consist with the other, is a task too great for man's finite powers. The mystery is too great for human solution.

There is the mysterious power of memory — whoever yet was able to grasp it in all its depth and height, breadth and length? What is the power by which we retain the past, recall it at will, and reproduce scenes which have long since passed away? Who that has ever endeavored to go back to the beginning of his own consciousness, and to find the vanishing line between it and the darkness that preceded it, does not know something of the mystery which environs the exercise of this faculty? And then, that memory never utterly fails, but that events and scenes long apparently forgotten are liable at any time to be recalled by the most trivial circum-

stance, even though they are buried beneath the accumulations of years — surely no one will say there is no mystery here! No subject connected with the human mind furnishes more interesting themes for study and speculation, than the power of memory. And, finally, the imagination — the power by which, out of the fragments of real scenes, we reconstruct scenes which are wholly ideal, and live in worlds of our own forming — who can tell what it is, or give anything like a satisfactory solution of the secret sources whence it springs?

As we pass from the purely mental, to the emotional part of our natures, the mystery is not lessened. We talk about love and hatred, fear, hope, and the like, but who knows anything of them further than that they exist, and as he has experienced them himself? What account can be given of that element of the soul which always bids us hope; to look away from the troubles of the present, to the peace and joy of a future? Or who can explain why it is that man must have an object of worship; that when the true God is unknown, people will adore gods of their own creation; and that even though they deny all religious things, they will yet, like the atheists of the old French Revolution, sing praises to abstract qualities, such as liberty, heroism, and the like? Who can solve the mystery of that principle within the heart of men, that has fired it for endeavors the most daring the world has seen, and presided over it, in ancient and modern times alike, from the cradle to the grave — its intense religious feeling, stronger than the fear of death?

But though life is a mystery, death is a greater mystery still. When we stand by the cold form of one who has passed away from these scenes, and gaze upon the pale face of the quiet sleeper, the question will come to us, "What has become of all the thoughts, feelings, hopes and fears, impulses and aspirations, which once were so active in the now senseless body?" Some think to avoid the mystery by asserting their total annihilation. But is it to be thus escaped? Is it any less wonderful that such powers, able as they are to triumph over all bodily sufferings, should forever cease to exist when

the body dies, than that they should live forever without the body? Is non-existence any less a mystery than its opposite? Can we any better conceive how that one, having once been, shall cease to be, than how it can live forever? The truth is, either thought is beyond our grasp, and we can no better comprehend the one than the other. The infidel who rejects Christianity and denies a future life, because they are mysterious and he cannot comprehend them, does not thus escape the incomprehensible. He can no more find a scientific basis for his belief in annihilation, than the Christian for his faith in immortality. Each is equally in the dark, when he comes to an explanation of the principle on which his conviction rests. To be, and not to be, when we go hence, are alike beyond our comprehension; and mystery we must have, whichever idea we adopt. He who hopes by any expedient to escape mystery, whether it relates to the life that now is or to that which is to come, hopes for that which never has been and never will be attained. 'We are environed and compassed round, at every step of our being, with an infinity which we cannot comprehend. Infinite space, infinite time, infinite power — who can grasp the ideas for which these expressions stand? We pause but for a moment and gaze back into the awful depths of an eternity that is past, and the soul sinks in the endeavor to comprehend it. Over the track of infinite ages, the mind wanders in vain for one resting-place, and for any solid foot-hold on which it can stand and gain a clear conception of its relations to the great and eternal Now. And then as it turns and wanders onward through the infinite future, and thinks of itself as forever living and never dying, its powers are paralyzed by the effort, and it shrinks back upon itself in trembling and dismay. Eternity is too vast for finite powers to comprehend. Only the Infinite Mind can grasp the idea of eternity. John Foster is said to have had so overpowering a sense of the meaning of the word, that he never spoke it as he did other words, but instinctively lingered upon its syllables, as if endeavoring to weigh their power. With solemn fear, only did he ever utter the word E-TER-NI-TY!

Who that feels what is implied by it, and what infinite interests are folded up in that for which it stands, does not speak it with feelings of reverent awe? When one remembers that this eternity is either for him, or that it is not, and that if it is, it is to be one of weal or woe, it cannot be that he can pass heedlessly by the questions which relate to these momentous interests. People who tell us that they are of no importance, and who would encourage us to think lightly of them, cannot do so with proper consideration. They but manifest a heedless, superficial and trifling spirit. Nothing is unimportant which pertains to interests that are never to end. The questions of the hour, deep and exciting as they may be, are trivial but as they relate to and bear upon eternal interests.

The mystery of life, instead of taking from the value of religion, gives it its chief worth. Over the dreary waste of human history, we see the presiding genius of religion, always and everywhere present, calling poor, bewildered and dying men to lean on the Infinite Arm, and press fearlessly on into the uncertain future, and not to shrink, though it leads through the dreary gateway of the tomb. It has taught them, when reason fails, humbly and calmly to trust. All religions, whether heathen or Jewish, have thus proved to be inestimable blessings to the race. Faith has dispelled fear, and enabled the soul, where it could not see, humbly and serenely to trust. The kind Father has implanted in every soul a religious element, which has been universally manifested in some form of belief and worship. Judaism, by inculcating the idea of one God, stands far above all others of the ancient forms of faith. The religion of Abraham, Moses, David, Isaiah, and others of the Hebrew patriarchs and prophets, shines in one long and luminous track over the dark waters of the past, like that we see on the bosom of a lake, when the moon mirrors itself in its waves.

But Jesus came with a purer faith, and one adapted to all shades of human thought and feeling, and designed to subvert all other forms of religion and to subdue the nations to itself. Its distinguishing doctrine is that of a Father, who presides

the body dies, than that they should live forever without the body? Is non-existence any less a mystery than its opposite? Can we any better conceive how that one, having once been, shall cease to be, than how it can live forever? The truth is, either thought is beyond our grasp, and we can no better comprehend the one than the other. The infidel who rejects Christianity and denies a future life, because they are mysterious and he cannot comprehend them, does not thus escape the incomprehensible. He can no more find a scientific basis for his belief in annihilation, than the Christian for his faith in immortality. Each is equally in the dark, when he comes to an explanation of the principle on which his conviction rests. To be, and not to be, when we go hence, are alike beyond our comprehension; and mystery we must have, whichever idea we adopt. He who hopes by any expedient to escape mystery, whether it relates to the life that now is or to that which is to come, hopes for that which never has been and never will be attained. We are environed and compassed round, at every step of our being, with an infinity which we cannot comprehend. Infinite space, infinite time, infinite power — who can grasp the ideas for which these expressions stand? We pause but for a moment and gaze back into the awful depths of an eternity that is past, and the soul sinks in the endeavor to comprehend it. Over the track of infinite ages, the mind wanders in vain for one resting-place, and for any solid foot-hold on which it can stand and gain a clear conception of its relations to the great and eternal Now. And then as it turns and wanders onward through the infinite future, and thinks of itself as forever living and never dying, its powers are paralyzed by the effort, and it shrinks back upon itself in trembling and dismay. Eternity is too vast for finite powers to comprehend. Only the Infinite Mind can grasp the idea of eternity. John Foster is said to have had so overpowering a sense of the meaning of the word, that he never spoke it as he did other words, but instinctively lingered upon its syllables, as if endeavoring to weigh their power. With solemn fear, only did he ever utter the word E-TER-NI-TY!

Who that feels what is implied by it, and what infinite interests are folded up in that for which it stands, does not speak it with feelings of reverent awe? When one remembers that this eternity is either for him, or that it is not, and that if it is, it is to be one of weal or woe, it cannot be that he can pass heedlessly by the questions which relate to these momentous interests. People who tell us that they are of no importance, and who would encourage us to think lightly of them, cannot do so with proper consideration. They but manifest a heedless, superficial and trifling spirit. Nothing is unimportant which pertains to interests that are never to end. The questions of the hour, deep and exciting as they may be, are trivial but as they relate to and bear upon eternal interests.

The mystery of life, instead of taking from the value of religion, gives it its chief worth. Over the dreary waste of human history, we see the presiding genius of religion, always and everywhere present, calling poor, bewildered and dying men to lean on the Infinite Arm, and press fearlessly on into the uncertain future, and not to shrink, though it leads through the dreary gateway of the tomb. It has taught them, when reason fails, humbly and calmly to trust. All religions, whether heathen or Jewish, have thus proved to be inestimable blessings to the race. Faith has dispelled fear, and enabled the soul, where it could not see, humbly and serenely to trust. The kind Father has implanted in every soul a religious element, which has been universally manifested in some form of belief and worship. Judaism, by inculcating the idea of one God, stands far above all others of the ancient forms of faith. The religion of Abraham, Moses, David, Isaiah, and others of the Hebrew patriarchs and prophets, shines in one long and luminous track over the dark waters of the past, like that we see on the bosom of a lake, when the moon mirrors itself in its waves.

But Jesus came with a purer faith, and one adapted to all shades of human thought and feeling, and designed to subvert all other forms of religion and to subdue the nations to itself. Its distinguishing doctrine is that of a Father, who presides

over all the affairs of the universe. It tells of a Father's house of many mansions, for the weary ones of earth, when they falter and fall in the journey of life. It opens to our longing visions scenes of social joy, to be more clearly revealed to us when we go hence and meet our kindred in the spirit-world. And thus over the darkness and the mystery of time and eternity, the Sun of Righteousness serenely shines. From the incertitude and doubt of the present and the future, we can turn to this glorious light and feel that our feet may confidently tread the paths it illumines. With the Psalmist we can say, "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for God is with me, and his rod shall comfort me." There is no other support. Abandon it, and we are thrown amid conjectures the most uncertain, and filled with apprehensions often the most appalling. There is no solid ground on which our weary feet can stand; and when we are about to leave the world, our departure is but a leap in the dark.

Article XI.

John Murray.

PART SIXTH.

Since our last contribution of this character, Cyrus Redding, Esq., of London, by whose favor we received this correspondence, has deceased, aged eighty-five years. He was a well-known literary man, author of a number of volumes of temporary value, and the companion of several generations of famous writers. He was the son of Mr. Murray's correspondent.

We continue our selections from Mr. Murray's correspondence with Rev. Robert Redding, at the following date Minister to a Baptist Church, Truro, Cornwall, England.

XXI.

Boston, May 23, 1799.

My very dear Friend,

A thing in season, how good it is! Never did anything come more in season than your charming little letter of March 20. I crawled out after a long confinement, so weak, so low in health, in flesh, and spirits; and, drawing up a heavy sigh, as I passed by the Post Office, I will stop, said I, and see if there is anything for me here. And your dear thrice-welcome favor was put into my hand. I returned home in better spirits, at least, if not in better health. I feared you were not as much my friend as ever. It is so long since I have seen a line from you, that I was persuaded some change had taken place. You might have been called home; or you might have forgotten me, or thought differently of me; or — or — in fact, I had a thousand thoughts, all calculated to perplex rather than to please; but your kind favor has dissipated every cloud, and all is clear again.

I bless God you are still in the same state of being I am in. I bless God you are still the same kind friend you ever were. I bless God for giving me such a friend, and *in your character*. O you know not how much I have suffered from wicked, deceitful men in the clerical character. Yon have made amends for all. Artless myself, I suspected no art. But no more of this.

Two years ago a very dear friend from Philadelphia visited me in this town. He was very rich, and very friendly. Mrs. Murray had nearly two thousand dollars from her father's estate. We knew not what to do with it. It was our all. The parents were dead: no more from them. He pitied us. He would take it. He would make it three thousand in a very little while. He would act the *friend*. It should cost us nothing. We gave it up to him. We *trusted* him. We asked nothing to show for it. He was a rich, a kind, a generous friend. It would have been base in me to suspect him. Artless myself, I suspected no art.

Late last fall I was informed there was reason to be afraid. I sat out for Philadelphia. I left in my place a brother, a dear fellow-laborer. He proved false, in every respect. He proved himself an enemy to my Master, and to me. He did me much wrong. He tried to do more. Artless myself, I suspected no art. I gained nothing of the little property I went after. It is gone. So shall I — no matter.

I travelled through the severest winter I have ever known; but I had the presence of our dear Saviour with me. I was blest in my labors, more than ever, for the time. My health was good. My spirits were good. My soul did magnify the Lord, and my spirit did rejoice in God my Saviour. I sang of mercy and judgment all the day long. I returned. I found my little family in health, my congregation in some confusion. I feared a division. I said nothing. I left the matter with our Master. It is over, and we go on as usual. I brought home a severe cold. I neglected myself. I did nothing to relieve me. My cold terminated in a large tumor under my arm. I have been seven weeks confined to my room, the greater part of the time to my bed. I have suffered more pain than I had suffered since I saw you. How great the goodness of God which has enabled me to say so! Why was I not all this time in pain? O how much am I debtor, on balance for good, to my Saviour! But it is all good. I find it good for me to be afflicted. These crosses are blessings in disguise. This abscess is still very distressing. Wearisome nights are appointed unto me. But I have a song in the night. "He that sat on the throne said, There shall be no more pain." Nothing is more pleasing in times of affliction, than to look forward to the rest which remaineth. O how delightful my Sabbaths have been since I have been in this suffering state! For though I have not been able to walk, I have been carried; and I have met my loved friends every time I have been with them as if it was the last. I have forgotten my pain, while I have been engaged in speaking well of the Redeemer's cause; but I return from the pulpit to bed.

* * * * * * * *

You are still at Truro. I am glad of it. You are in a delightful place, and with a charming people. For their sake, and for the sake of your dear little family, and indeed for my sake, I humbly hope and trust you may continue there, as long as you can be of use to them and to yourself. I bless God most devoutly that you go on *pleasantly* with your church. "How good and how pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" Your dear Cheswater friends are alive unto God, and you have lately had additions to your number: all this is charming to me. "It is the Lord's doings." I am this moment in Cheswater. I throw my eyes over the serious, solemn audience, and the tear of transport starts into my eye. How delightful to be able to

feel so much pleasure by reflection! How great the blessing of memory!

"Nor love, nor holy friendship, without thee
Could ever of the least devotion be,
Nor gratitude, nor truth, nor piety.
Where thou art not, the cheerless human mind
Is one vast void, all darksome, sad, and blind:
No trace of anything remains behind.
And when at last we quit this mortal scene,
Thou with our tender friends shalt still remain,
And time, and death, shall strike at thee in vain."

How often have I enjoyed the pleasures I was blest with in the society of you and your dear connections since I left you, through this inestimable blessing — memory! But like a person who has lost his sight, you will always appear to my mental view, as you did when I saw you last. Well: it is as well that it should be so. The last was a most pleasing view, and when we meet again, it will be better still. We shall then have "beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness."

I am sorry the dear old Lady is so much in the dark, that she has almost lost her sight; but she will soon be reconciled to this loss, if she still be blest with hearing. "Though darkness," said the blind boy —

"Though darkness still betide me,
It aids interior sight,
And from such scenes defends me
As blush to see the light.
Hence, then, no need of wailing;
I see no reason why:
Mankind to their own failing
Are all as blind as I."

You were just going to social meeting. Your dear old parent could have enjoyed the pleasures of that meeting if she was quite blind. You don't know why I say so much on this head. I will tell you. I expect to outlive my own sight. I find my sight fail me very fast. I am willing, therefore, to think as well of this momentary state of darkness as I can.

* * * * * * * *

I pity the poor people of the Octagon. I am afraid the dear people have just enough of religion to make them miserable. I pity them, and I pity any one that may settle among them. Alas for them! They have too much of the leaven our Saviour cautioned his disciples against. But I should be surprised at nothing in them after the treatment they gave the dear man who was taken from them a little before I saw them. I felicitate the last worthy man that left

them, on his leaving them so soon. And yet the high-priest of our profession still feels an affection for the members of that congregation. But many waters cannot quench *his* love, nor all floods drown it.

You have no conception how much delight you give me in the kind assurance you afford me that you still honor me with your friendly regard. But I really should not feel so much delighted on these occasions, if I did not feel my heart all you conceive of it. O could I once more embrace you, once more accompany you as we once walked together, or —

> "'Neath any venerable shade,
> For thought and friendly converse made,"

could we freely unbosom ourselves! For I have a thousand times more to say to you now than when I saw you before. How happy it would make me! But even there and then, the shades may be too dark. There may be a serpent in our path, or briers and thorns may infest the soil. Or, suppose it a flowery path, no serpent in the wood, we should be obliged to think of separating, and it would be to me a painful thought. From this, then, I am led to sweet reflection on the meeting you advert to. Yes: we shall meet in another and a better world. We shall meet in our Father's house, in which are many mansions. Our Saviour is gone before to prepare a place for us. We shall soon hear his cheering voice, saying, "Come up hither." O, yes: he died for you and me, that whether we wake, or sleep, we may live *together* with him. Believing this, I enter into rest. Not believing this, I could find no rest. There is a divine reality in the religion of our God. It is not a cunningly devised fable. It bears our spirits up. It gives us peace and joy in believing. That you and yours may experience this more and more continually, is the fervent prayer of

Your ever affectionate friend, &c.,

JOHN MURRAY.

Who was Mr. Murray's false friend who subjected him to pecuniary loss, we have no means of ascertaining, and consequently no means, as disinterested friends, of correcting Mr. M.'s impressions, if they were mistaken, by a view of all the circumstances. But we know who was the "dear fellow-laborer," deemed false by the vexed traveller, and who proved himself, in the latter's estimation, an enemy to his Master

and to him. It was Rev. Hosea Ballou, then of Dana, Mass., and twenty-seven years of age. What Mr. Murray meant, in the overflow of his confidence toward his English friend, when he spoke of an enemy to his Master, was a "Socinian." This is more fully developed in a later letter. Mr. Ballou had already developed Unitarian tendencies. He rejected many of his senior's most cherished notions. He had probably varied from Trinitarians much more than the latter supposed. It is not strange that Mr. Murray was sensitive regarding the differences which were continually widening between himself and his brethren. When he accepted Relly's views, the contrast with Whitefield's was so great that he accepted the whole as the Body of Divinity. He rejoiced, as we see, in the light. He never thought of examining the details with reference to their consistency or reasonableness. His mind was not analytical. Recognizing the Universalism of the Scriptures, their meaning upon other points, collateral or otherwise, partook of the previous coloring of his mind. The Trinitarianism and Calvinism and Mysticism remained. That he favored fanciful interpretations of parable and prophecy is not surprising, seeing that it was prominently a characteristic of the theology of the last century. It is well known that the absolute Deity of Jesus Christ was the fundamental Christian doctrine with Mr. Murray, and it was also the basis of his Universalism. According to Dr. Whittemore, Mr. Ballou had already avowed his Unitarianism, although it may not have been generally known, in the general dearth of books, papers, and intercourse.

When Mr. Murray was called by the circumstances narrated in the foregoing letter, to visit Philadelphia, Mr. Ballou was employed to preach ten Sabbaths in Mr. Murray's church. It was on the last of these that Mrs. M. took occasion to have it announced by a gentleman that "the doctrine which has been preached here this afternoon is not the doctrine which is usually preached in this house." To which the young man in the pulpit quietly replied, "The audience will please to take notice of what our brother has said," and proceeded to

read the hymn. The "confusion" Mr. Murray found on his return, and the division he feared, were evidently occasioned by the favorable effect of Mr. Ballou's preaching, not the less because of Mrs. Murray's indiscretion. That in point of fact Mr. B. was not a particle at fault, unless it was his duty to conceal his own opinions, is evident from the sequel. Negotiations were opened with him, looking to his removal to Boston, and the erection of a new house of worship. His decision was instant. "I cannot," said he, "do anything to injure Brother Murray, nor the beloved society to which he ministers." It was eighteen years later, when Mr. Ballou, matured by study and experience, settled in Boston: Mr. Murray having, under the pressure of age and infirmity, been already gathered to his eternal home.

It is questionable, however, whether the organization of a second society in Boston, in 1799, ought to have been held to be a personal offence to the pastor or members of the first. If Murray and Ballou could both have labored in harmony, each upon his own ground, the one for Trinitarian Universalism, the other for Unitarian, who can tell what results might have accrued? The only avowed Unitarian Church in Boston was King's Chapel, Dr. Freeman's. Others were drifting in that direction; and Mr. Ballou, although without the culture of some of the Congregational ministers, might have affected the public thought with a larger faith than it in fact realized. The jealousy of new movements in our larger cities may originate in a want of self-reliant manliness, as distrust may also be bred from a calm judgment of all the facts.

XXII.

Boston, July 12, 1799.

My very dear Friend: I should feel a kind of guilt on my mind, if at any time I let an opportunity pass unimproved by writing to you. One this moment offers, though it is a momentary one. I embrace it to inform you that, through the good-will of Him that dwelt in the bush, I am in a better state of health than when I wrote to you last. . . . . You will, I trust, remember the hint I ventured to give you, respecting writing to your unworthy friend: that is, to have

your letter ready, waiting for a favorable opportunity. By this means you can converse more at ease than you could if you did as I now do. But thinking there would be no other chance till next Fall, I had no idea of writing again till that season. . . .

Though in your last you had the goodness to tell me you were well in body, mind and circumstances, yet as the state we live in is a changing state, you may be in a worse, or in a still better state. Let me know from time to time how you go on, that I may rejoice with you, if you are in a joyous state, — that I may have the melancholy pleasure of mourning with you, if otherwise. For nothing which respects or affects you can be indifferent to your friend. With respect to public matters, though we are not of this world, and in it have no continuing city, yet, being in it, we cannot feel indifferent respecting the things which have come and are coming to pass in these days.

"Redeemer! thou wilt come, —
These signs point out the way, —
To bring thy ransomed home:
We wait the glorious day!
Till then we calmly rest in thee,
From dread of each ill-boding free."

Can you do this? It is what I wish to do, and sometimes can, but not always. There is no stability in my times. I am a poor, changing creature; but He who made all things changeth not. He does, and will continue to do, all things well. But the axes, and the saws, are boasting themselves against Him that cuts with them; and things formed are saying unto Him that formed them, Why hast thou made me thus? There are undoubtedly times of trouble, both in fact and in fancy; and we would, had we the power, change them, we think for the better. But "my thoughts," saith the Lord, "are not your thoughts, nor my ways your ways: as the heavens are above the earth, so are my ways above your ways."

We live, my brother, in a very interesting period of time. Great changes have taken place in this world since we came into it, and greater still may take place before we go out of it. And many of these changes may to *us* appear for the worse; and so they would assuredly, were they not under the direction of Infinite Wisdom and Infinite Goodness, who when he gives is supremely good, nor less so when he denies. For crosses and afflictions from his hands are blessings in disguise. But among all the changes which have taken place in

this changing state of things, no one has more surprised and pleased me than the change which has taken place in this country respecting the French. When I saw you they were considered the political saviours of this country. Now they are considered as our adversary the devil, going about seeking to devour us, and are hated as much, and much more, than the devil they are supposed to be under the influence of. This is an amazing revolution. Who could have thought it?

But this is an age of revolutions. I see in the religious world as great revolutions. I was yesterday invited, in a very polite manner, to attend at an ordination in one of the oldest meeting-houses in this town, at which were present the Episcopalians, Baptists, and all others in this place; and a stranger would have found it difficult to have determined which was of the one or of the other denomination, except by his dress. And in this, also, there is now a very great similarity. When I see myself seated in the midst of those who were once my greatest enemies and bitterest persecutors, I am ready to ask, Is it that they are better? or that I am worse? Then I find all the preaching and praying in the same style. They are all for charity, and ever thanking God for condescending to become the Saviour of the world; and praying with real or apparent devotion for the expected day, when the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, whom to know is life eternal, and the kingdoms of the world be the kingdom of Christ Jesus. So that, in fact, were you to form a judgment of them by their preaching, and especially by their praying, you would conclude them all as great Universalists as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and all the holy prophets from the beginning of the world were. Think you, that when I sit and hear them thus confirm my once despised testimony, I do not feel more than I can express, especially when many in the congregation throw their eyes on me, as if they would say, This is like you? When I was confined with pain and sore distress, these reverend doctors came to see me in the kindest manner, calling me their brother, and sympathizing with me. One indeed, and only one, of the clergy in this place, I am informed, was heard to say that he hoped I never should recover. The clergyman who gave me this information assured me it was a fact; for I doubted his *saying* so much. But I did not and do not think the worse of him for it. I doubt not he would think he did God service in killing me. But it is astonishing how few there are of this disposition in the present day. Whatever may be the cause,

the effect is to me most pleasing, though in some respects I should gain more by persecution. However, I have the pleasure to live in peace. I am in the habit of friendly sociability with my Father's children. I can now take them by the hand, as I always wished to do, as brethren.

I am now charmingly situated in a most delightful part of the town. I have as many of the comforts of life as I can comfortably enjoy, with the blessed prospect of a glorious immortality; so that, in fact, were it not for pain of body, and some vexations of mind, and, above all, for this plague of the heart, which is a perpetual plague to me, and will be as long as I remain in this house of my earthly tabernacle, in the walls of which this plague is, I should be content to tarry where I am. But, everything considered, I am very ready to depart and be with Christ, in whose presence is fulness of joy, because nothing that defileth can ever enter there. . . .

Your ever affectionate friend, JOHN MURRAY.

GENERAL REVIEW.

The Moabite Stone.

OUR readers will remember that we called attention, in the *Quarterly* for October, 1870, to the discovery of the important monument known as the "Moabite Stone." The discovery has attracted general attention from antiquarians and Biblical students. Several treatises have already appeared in English, French and German. The circumstances of its finding are singularly interesting. In August, 1868, an attaché of the French Consulate, at Jerusalem, M. Ganneau, was informed that there existed near the eastern shores of the Dead Sea, the Ancient Moab, a block of black stone, or marble, covered with inscriptions. Curious to ascertain what it could be, and the character of the writing, he employed a young and intelligent Arab to go to the place designated, take measurements, and obtain an impression on paper prepared for the purpose.[1] He had nearly accomplished his

[1] The stone is thirty-nine inches high, twenty inches wide, and the same in thickness; of heavy black basalt; in the shape of an ordinary grave-stone.

purpose when there arose a quarrel among the Bedouins, who had somehow come to know that Europeans were interested in the monument, and that it was of great value. The quarrel respected the ownership of the stone. Happily the young Arab had presence of mind enough in the midst of the *mélée* to snatch the half-finished impression from the stone, and, springing upon his horse, he escaped with only a spear wound in the leg.

Subsequently the Bedouins, by the aid of fire and water, broke the precious monument into several pieces, thinking to sell these to the Franks for more than they could obtain for the stone entire. About two-thirds of these pieces, containing six hundred and sixty-nine letters out of one thousand, have been purchased by M. Ganneau, and are now in Jerusalem. Impressions have been taken of all these pieces, and, together with that obtained before the breakage, have been published in *fac simile* in the "Revue Archæologique."

In the "Bibliotheca Sacra" for October, 1870, the original, Hebrew, and a translation are given, and in "Jerusalem Recovered," just issued by D. Appleton & Co., we have three other translations, two by Ganneau, and that by Prof. Schlottmann. Believing that our readers will be glad to see this ancient writing, we give place to one of these translations. It will be remembered that this remarkable monument is older than two-thirds of the Old Testament, dating back nine centuries before Christ! and covers the same ground occupied by a portion of the Books of Kings, giving the Moabite history of the struggles between Mesha and the Israelitish kings. The third chapter of 2 Kings furnishes a record of the campaign of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram against this very Mesha, King of Moab.

The words of the original inscription are separated by points, and the sentences by perpendicular lines. In the following translation, the letters in brackets are conjectural readings to fill the place of words destroyed by the breaking of the stone, the spaces corresponding in length with those in the *fac simile*.

"I am Mesha, son of Chemosh [nadab,] King of Moab, [the D-] ibonite. | My father reigned over Moab thirty years, and I reigned after my father. | And I made this high place to Chemosh in Karhah,[2] and this House of Salvation, because he has saved me from all

[2] *Chemosh* was the national deity of the Moabites, as may be seen in Numbers xxi. 29, and particularly in Jeremiah xlviii. 3, 13, 46. Solomon, when going after other gods, introduced his worship into Jerusalem, 1 Kings xi. 7: "Then did Solomon build an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab in the hill before Jerusalem." See also 2 Kings xxiii. Dr Guisburg says that out of twelve or fifteen Moabite cities mentioned in the Old Testament, eleven of them are named in this inscription.

the attacks, and because he has caused me to look on all my enemies. | O [mr] i was King of Israel, and he afflicted Moab many days, because Chemosh was angry with his [land]. | And his son succeeded him, and he also said, "I will afflict Moab." | In my days he spake thus, and I looked on him and on his house, | and Israel kept continually perishing. And Omri held possession of the land (?) of Medeba. And there dwelt in it [Omri and his son and his grand] son forty years. [But] Chemosh [restored] it in my days. | And I built Baal-Meon, and I made in it ———— And I [besieged] (?) Kirjathaim. | And the men of God had dwelt of old in the land [Kirjathaim.] And the King of Israel built for him [Kirjathaim.] | And I fought against the city, and took it. | And I slew all the [men of] the city, a spectacle to Chemosh and to Moab. | And I brought back from thence the [altar of Jehovah, and put] it before Chemosh in Kerioth. | And I caused to dwell therein the men of Shirah; and the men of —— Sharath. | And Chemosh said to me, "Go and take Nebo from Israel." | [And I ——] went in the night, and I fought against it from the overspreading of the dawn till noon. | And I [took it, and I utterly destroyed] it, and I slew all of it, seven thousand ———, for to Ashtor Chemosh had [I] devoted [them,] and I took from thence the vessels of Jehovah, and I presented them before Chemosh. | And the King of Israel [built] Jahaz, and dwelt in it while he was fighting against me. | And Chemosh drove him from [before me; and] I took from Moab two hundred men, all told; | and I attacked (?) Jahaz and took it, joining it to Dibon. | I built Karhah, the wall of the forests, and the wall of the hill (Ophel.) | And I built its gates, and I built its towers. | And I made a royal palace, and I made reservoirs for the collection of the waters in the midst of the city. | And there was no cistern in the midst of the city in Karhah; and I said to all the people, "Make for you each man a cistern in his house." And I dug ditches (?) for Karhah [in the road to] Israel. | I built [A]roer, and I made the high way to Arnon. I built Beth-Bamoth, for it was ruined, | and I built Bozrah, for it was deserted. (?) And I set in Dibon garrisons; (?) for all Dibon was submissive. | And I filled (?) —— in the cities which I added to the land. | And I built —— and the temple of Diblathaim, | and the temple of Baal-Meon, and I raised up there —— —— the land. | And there in Horonaim —— Chemosh said to me, "Go, fight against Horonaim. | And I ———— Chemosh in my days . . . . "

How wonderful that this monument should have been preserved through all the ages — a monument set up, and its inscription cut, near to the time when Solomon was building his temple! Is it not highly probable that more such treasures might be found in the wilderness around the Dead Sea, if thorough exploration were made? And then how like a chapter from the Old Testament this Moabite

purpose when there arose a quarrel among the Bedouins, who had somehow come to know that Europeans were interested in the monument, and that it was of great value. The quarrel respected the ownership of the stone. Happily the young Arab had presence of mind enough in the midst of the *mélée* to snatch the half-finished impression from the stone, and, springing upon his horse, he escaped with only a spear wound in the leg.

Subsequently the Bedouins, by the aid of fire and water, broke the precious monument into several pieces, thinking to sell these to the Franks for more than they could obtain for the stone entire. About two-thirds of these pieces, containing six hundred and sixty-nine letters out of one thousand, have been purchased by M. Ganneau, and are now in Jerusalem. Impressions have been taken of all these pieces, and, together with that obtained before the breakage, have been published in *fac simile* in the "Revue Archæologique."

In the "Bibliotheca Sacra" for October, 1870, the original, Hebrew, and a translation are given, and in "Jerusalem Recovered," just issued by D. Appleton & Co., we have three other translations, two by Ganneau, and that by Prof. Schlottmann. Believing that our readers will be glad to see this ancient writing, we give place to one of these translations. It will be remembered that this remarkable monument is older than two-thirds of the Old Testament, dating back nine centuries before Christ! and covers the same ground occupied by a portion of the Books of Kings, giving the Moabite history of the struggles between Mesha and the Israelitish kings. The third chapter of 2 Kings furnishes a record of the campaign of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram against this very Mesha, King of Moab.

The words of the original inscription are separated by points, and the sentences by perpendicular lines. In the following translation, the letters in brackets are conjectural readings to fill the place of words destroyed by the breaking of the stone, the spaces corresponding in length with those in the *fac simile*.

"I am Mesha, son of Chemosh [nadab,] King of Moab, [the D-] ibonite. | My father reigned over Moab thirty years, and I reigned after my father. | And I made this high place to Chemosh in Karhah,[2] and this House of Salvation, because he has saved me from all

[2] *Chemosh* was the national deity of the Moabites, as may be seen in Numbers xxi. 29, and particularly in Jeremiah xlviii. 3, 13, 46. Solomon, when going after other gods, introduced his worship into Jerusalem, 1 Kings xi. 7: "Then did Solomon build an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab in the hill before Jerusalem." See also 2 Kings xxiii. Dr Guisburg says that out of twelve or fifteen *mentioned* in the Old Testament, eleven of them are named in this in

purpose when there arose a quarrel among the Bedouins, who had somehow come to know that Europeans were interested in the monument, and that it was of great value. The quarrel respected the ownership of the stone. Happily the young Arab had presence of mind enough in the midst of the *mêlée* to snatch the half-finished impression from the stone, and, springing upon his horse, he escaped with only a spear wound in the leg.

Subsequently the Bedouins, by the aid of fire and water, broke the precious monument into several pieces, thinking to sell these to the Franks for more than they could obtain for the stone entire. About two-thirds of these pieces, containing six hundred and sixty-nine letters out of one thousand, have been purchased by M. Ganneau, and are now in Jerusalem. Impressions have been taken of all these pieces, and, together with that obtained before the breakage, have been published in *fac simile* in the "Revue Archæologique."

In the "Bibliotheca Sacra" for October, 1870, the original, Hebrew, and a translation are given, and in "Jerusalem Recovered," just issued by D. Appleton & Co., we have three other translations, two by Ganneau, and that by Prof. Schlottmann. Believing that our readers will be glad to see this ancient writing, we give place to one of these translations. It will be remembered that this remarkable monument is older than two-thirds of the Old Testament, dating back nine centuries before Christ! and covers the same ground occupied by a portion of the Books of Kings, giving the Moabite history of the struggles between Mesha and the Israelitish kings. The third chapter of 2 Kings furnishes a record of the campaign of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram against this very Mesha, King of Moab.

The words of the original inscription are separated by points, and the sentences by perpendicular lines. In the following translation, the letters in brackets are conjectural readings to fill the place of words destroyed by the breaking of the stone, the spaces corresponding in length with those in the *fac simile*.

"I am Mesha, son of Chemosh [nadab,] King of Moab, [the D-] ibonite. | My father reigned over Moab thirty years, and I reigned after my father. | And I made this high place to Chemosh in Karhah,[2] and this House of Salvation, because he has saved me from all

[2] *Chemosh* was the national deity of the Moabites, as may be seen in Numbers xxi. 29, and particularly in Jeremiah xlviii. 8, 13, 46. Solomon, when going after other gods, introduced his worship into Jerusalem, 1 Kings xi. 7: "Then did Solomon build an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab in the hill before Jerusalem." See also 2 Kings xxiii. Dr Guisburg says that out of twelve or fifteen Moabite cities mentioned in the Old Testament, eleven of them are named in this inscription.

the attacks, and because he has caused me to look on all my enemies. | O [mr] i was King of Israel, and he afflicted Moab many days, because Chemosh was angry with his [land]. | And his son succeeded him, and he also said, "I will afflict Moab." | In my days he spake thus, and I looked on him and on his house, | and Israel kept continually perishing. And Omri held possession of the land (?) of Medeba. And there dwelt in it [Omri and his son and his grand] son forty years. [But] Chemosh [restored] it in my days. | And I built Baal-Meon, and I made in it ———— And I [besieged] (?) Kirjathaim. | And the men of God had dwelt of old in the land [Kirjathaim.] And the King of Israel built for him [Kirjathaim.] | And I fought against the city, and took it. | And I slew all the [men of] the city, a spectacle to Chemosh and to Moab. | And I brought back from thence the [altar of Jehovah, and put] it before Chemosh in Kerioth. | And I caused to dwell therein the men of Shirah; and the men of —— Sharath. | And Chemosh said to me, "Go and take Nebo from Israel." | [And I ——] went in the night, and I fought against it from the overspreading of the dawn till noon. | And I [took it, and I utterly destroyed] it, and I slew all of it, seven thousand ————, for to Ashtor Chemosh had [I] devoted [them,] and I took from thence the vessels of Jehovah, and I presented them before Chemosh. | And the King of Israel [built] Jahaz, and dwelt in it while he was fighting against me. | And Chemosh drove him from [before me; and] I took from Moab two hundred men, all told; | and I attacked (?) Jahaz and took it, joining it to Dibon. | I built Karhah, the wall of the forests, and the wall of the hill (Ophel.) | And I built its gates, and I built its towers. | And I made a royal palace, and I made reservoirs for the collection of the waters in the midst of the city. | And there was no cistern in the midst of the city in Karhah; and I said to all the people, "Make for you each man a cistern in his house." And I dug ditches (?) for Karhah [in the road to] Israel. | I built [A]roer, and I made the high way to Arnon. I built Beth-Bamoth, for it was ruined, | and I built Bozrah, for it was deserted. (?) And I set in Dibon garrisons; (?) for all Dibon was submissive. | And I filled (?) —— in the cities which I added to the land. | And I built —— and the temple of Diblathaim, | and the temple of Baal-Meon, and I raised up there —— —— the land. | And there in Horonaim —— Chemosh said to me, "Go, fight against Horonaim. | And I ———— Chemosh in my days . . . . "

How wonderful that this monument should have been preserved through all the ages — a monument set up, and its inscription cut, near to the time when Solomon was building his temple! Is it not highly probable that more such treasures might be found in the wilderness around the Dead Sea, if thorough exploration were made? And then how like a chapter from the Old Testament this Moabite

narrative reads. Its style, language, names of gods, of kings, and of places, are all the same; and one might easily imagine he was reading a lost chapter from the Book of Chronicles.

Before this discovery there was no proof, outside the Bible itself, of the truth of the record about Mesha and the Moabite war; but it turns out after all that through all these centuries there has been waiting there on the shore of the Dead Sea a witness which could testify directly to the point — if only we had known it — even this record of Mesha himself. How many more such witnesses are, in the providence of God, waiting there, and elsewhere, to be called, who can tell? As Dr. Whedon says, "Such a fragment of Moabite history nine centuries before Christ, suddenly authenticating the minute and obscure thread of Israelite history, is eminently suggestive. It furnishes a brief but very convincing proof that the old Hebrew records are truly contemporary and historical; that they passed through the eastern captivities unmarred; that the Hebrew editors at the restoration were true to their duty, and that our present text is proximately a genuine copy of the primitive documents."

At a recent meeting of the Ethnological Department of the British Association, Dr. Guisburg stated, in a paper on the subject, that

"Respecting the relation of the ancient Moabites to the neighboring nations, he had come to the conclusion that at the period indicated an organized temple-service existed among Jews out of Palestine, and that the service must have been very much akin to the service of the Moabites; that nine hundred years before Christ the word 'Jehovah,' which was afterwards so much avoided by the Jews, was so much upon the lips of every Jew that it passed over to a neighboring nation; that the language of the inscription, which was infinitely more simple than two-thirds of the Old Testament, showed that the Moabites had attained to a high state of cultivation; that in military prowess they were superior to the Jews; and that from them the ancient Greeks and Romans, and we ourselves, had derived what had become our alphabet."

Rejoicing in this discovery, we feel confident that from Judea and the regions round about there are more yet to come. Doubtless Jerusalem has many such treasures buried a hundred feet or more below the surface of her present site, which, it is hoped, the Palestine Exploring Expedition will yet bring to light to the astonishment and edification of an expectant world.

Mohammedanism in Africa.

THE rapid spread of the Arabic language, and the growth of Mohammedanism, in Africa, constitute one of the significant signs of the times. Occasionally we have given paragraphs in the "Religious World," illustrating this, and showing the relation of the two facts to each other. The subject is one of great interest, and is closely connected with the future progress of Christianity among the Negro races in these barbarous realms.

Years ago, in an article on Mohammed, printed in these pages, we had occasion to show the better side of the Arabian prophet, and of his religion as set out in the Koran. It was seen that his mission and teachings were not wholly evil, and that it was no easy matter for an impartial judge to decide whether there was not in the man more of the religious enthusiast than of the imposter. Recent observations and inquiries in Western and Central Africa, among the aboriginal tribes, reveal the fact that the religion of Mohammed, which so largely shapes and controls the character and destiny of more than one hundred and sixty million of men, has within it elements of saving power, and is doing a beneficent work among the converted tribes, and lifting them to a higher civilization, to a level of morality and religious life far above that of the surrounding pagan tribes.

Seventy years ago the moral and social contrast between the Pagan and Mohammedan negroes was observed by Mungo Park everywhere on the line of his travels. The entire absence of all kinds of intoxicating drinks was particularly noticed — the Pagans drinking beer and meed to excess, while the Mohammedan converts drank *nothing but water.* "Thus," says Prof. Blyden, of Liberia College, "throughout Central Africa there has been established a vast *total abstinence society;* and such is the influence of this society that where there are Moslem inhabitants, even in pagan towns, it is a very rare thing to see a person intoxicated. They thus present an almost impenetrable barrier to the desolating flood of ardent spirits with which traders from Europe and America inundate the coast, and of which we have recently had truthful and sadly suggestive accounts from a missionary at Gaboon."

In addition to this important reform in the condition of the Negroes, we have also the momentous fact that Mohammedanism is by its steady work of conversion gradually contracting the territorial limits, and abolishing the institution, of slavery; for, as our readers

narrative reads. Its style, language, names of gods, of kings, and of places, are all the same; and one might easily imagine he was reading a lost chapter from the Book of Chronicles.

Before this discovery there was no proof, outside the Bible itself, of the truth of the record about Mesha and the Moabite war; but it turns out after all that through all these centuries there has been waiting there on the shore of the Dead Sea a witness which could testify directly to the point — if only we had known it — even this record of Mesha himself. How many more such witnesses are, in the providence of God, waiting there, and elsewhere, to be called, who can tell? As Dr. Whedon says, "Such a fragment of Moabite history nine centuries before Christ, suddenly authenticating the minute and obscure thread of Israelite history, is eminently suggestive. It furnishes a brief but very convincing proof that the old Hebrew records are truly contemporary and historical; that they passed through the eastern captivities unmarred; that the Hebrew editors at the restoration were true to their duty, and that our present text is proximately a genuine copy of the primitive documents."

At a recent meeting of the Ethnological Department of the British Association, Dr. Guisburg stated, in a paper on the subject, that

"Respecting the relation of the ancient Moabites to the neighboring nations, he had come to the conclusion that at the period indicated an organized temple-service existed among Jews out of Palestine, and that the service must have been very much akin to the service of the Moabites; that nine hundred years before Christ the word 'Jehovah,' which was afterwards so much avoided by the Jews, was so much upon the lips of every Jew that it passed over to a neighboring nation; that the language of the inscription, which was infinitely more simple than two-thirds of the Old Testament, showed that the Moabites had attained to a high state of cultivation; that in military prowess they were superior to the Jews; and that from them the ancient Greeks and Romans, and we ourselves, had derived what had become our alphabet."

Rejoicing in this discovery, we feel confident that from Judea and the regions round about there are more yet to come. Doubtless Jerusalem has many such treasures buried a hundred feet below the surface of her present site, which it is hoped the Palestine Exploring Expedition will yet bring to light to the [illegible] and edification of an expectant world.

The [illegible]
M[illegible]
[illegible]
W[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
Y[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

know, the moment a slave embraces the religion of the Koran, he is a free man. Of course, too, with the conversion of these tribes there comes an end of the barbarous wars carried on in the interests of slavery, and which have so long arrayed the various peoples in hostility to each other, prevented the growth of arts and manufactures, the cultivation of the earth, and those peaceful pursuits which are indispensable to civilization. This alone is a reason for rejoicing in the steady progress of Mohammedanism in the wilds of Africa, looking upon it as an immense advance on heathenism, and the pioneer, as we hope, of Christianity. Prof. Blyden says in the *Methodist Quarterly* for January, from which we borrow most of these facts, that,

"From Senegal to Lagos, over two thousand miles, there is scarcely an important town on the sea-board where there are not at least one mosque and active representatives of Islam, often side by side with the Christian teacher. And as soon as a pagan, however obscure or degraded, embraces the Moslem faith, he is at once admitted as an equal to their society.

The introduction of Islam into Central and West Africa has been the most important, if not the sole, preservative against the desolations of the slave-trade. Mohammedanism furnished a protection to the tribes who embraced it by effectually binding them together in one strong religious fraternity, and enabling them by their united effort to baffle the attempts of powerful pagan slave-hunters. Enjoying this comparative immunity from sudden hostile incursions, industry was stimulated among them; industry diminished their poverty, and as they increased in worldly substance, they also increased in desire for knowledge. Gross superstition gradually disappeared from among them. Receiving a degree of culture from the study of the Arabic language, they acquired loftier views, wider tastes, and those energetic habits which so pleasingly distinguish them from their pagan neighbors.

Large towns and cities have grown up under Mohammedan energy and industry. Dr. Barth was surprised to find such towns or cities as Kano and Sokoto in the centre of Africa — to discover the focus of a complex and widely ramified commerce, and a busy hive of manufacturing industry, in a region which most people had believed to be a desert. And there are towns and cities nearly as important farther west, to which Barth did not penetrate, affording still scope to extend the horizon of European knowledge and the limits of commercial enterprise. Mr. Benjamin Anderson, the enterprising Liberian traveller, who has recently visited Misodu, the capital of the Western Mandingoes, about two hundred miles east of Monrovia, describes that city as the centre of a considerable commerce, reaching as far north as Senegal and east as far as Sokoto."

The study of Arabic among these Mohammedan Negroes is pursued with great zeal, and the educational acquirements of some of the young men are really remarkable. Accidentally meeting a lad from one of the interior districts, Prof. Blyden gave him an Arabic New Testament, "which he read with unimpeded fluency, and with the Oriental accent and pronunciation." The Koran is studied with as much earnestness and enthusiasm in the large towns of Western and Central Africa, as it is at Cairo or Bagdad.

"In travelling in the exterior of Liberia we have met ulemas, or learned men, who could reproduce from memory any chapter of the Koran, with its vowels and dots and other grammatical marks. The boys under their instruction are kept at the study of the books for years. First they are taught the letters and vowel marks, then they are taught to read the text without receiving any insight into its meaning. When they can read fluently they are taught the meaning of the words, which they commit carefully to memory. Young men who intend to be enrolled among the ulemas take up history and chronology, on which they have some fragmentary manuscripts. Before a student is admitted to the ranks of the learned, he must pass an examination, usually lasting seven days, conducted by a Board consisting of imáms and ulemas. If he is successful, he is led around the town on horseback with instrumental music and singing. After which the candidate is presented with a sash or scarf, usually of fine white cloth of native manufacture, which he is thenceforth permitted to wind round his cap, with one end hanging down the back, forming the Oriental turban. This is a sort of Bachelor of Arts diploma. The men who wear turbans have read and recited the Koran through many hundred times; and you can refer to no passage which they cannot readily find in their apparently confused manuscripts of loose leaves and pages, distinguished not by numbers, but by catch words at the bottom."

Travelling Mohammedan missionaries traverse the country continually from the western coasts to Egypt, Syria and Arabia; and wherever there is an opening they enter and commence the work of conversion; beginning generally with the instruction of the children in Arabic, and the teaching of the precepts of the Koran. In this way the Arabic is penetrating into the interior of Africa; and all across the country there are, as it were, stations connecting the language in one continuous line from the eastern to the western shores. In this way an important preparatory work is already done for the Christian missionary, who, if thoroughly instructed in the Arabic, and able to preach in that tongue, will find the field ready to the har

know, the moment a slave embraces the religion of the Koran, he is a free man. Of course, too, with the conversion of these tribes there comes an end of the barbarous wars carried on in the interests of slavery, and which have so long arrayed the various peoples in hostility to each other, prevented the growth of arts and manufactures, the cultivation of the earth, and those peaceful pursuits which are indispensable to civilization. This alone is a reason for rejoicing in the steady progress of Mohammedanism in the wilds of Africa, looking upon it as an immense advance on heathenism, and the pioneer, as we hope, of Christianity. Prof. Blyden says in the *Methodist Quarterly* for January, from which we borrow most of these facts, that,

"From Senegal to Lagos, over two thousand miles, there is scarcely an important town on the sea-board where there are not at least one mosque and active representatives of Islam, often side by side with the Christian teacher. And as soon as a pagan, however obscure or degraded, embraces the Moslem faith, he is at once admitted as an equal to their society.

The introduction of Islam into Central and West Africa has been the most important, if not the sole, preservative against the desolations of the slave-trade. Mohammedanism furnished a protection to the tribes who embraced it by effectually binding them together in one strong religious fraternity, and enabling them by their united effort to baffle the attempts of powerful pagan slave-hunters. Enjoying this comparative immunity from sudden hostile incursions, industry was stimulated among them; industry diminished their poverty, and as they increased in worldly substauce, they also increased in desire for knowledge. Gross superstition gradually disappeared from among them. Receiving a degree of culture from the study of the Arabic language, they acquired loftier views, wider tastes, and those energetic habits which so pleasingly distinguish them from their pagan neighbors.

Large towns and cities have grown up under Mohammedan energy and industry. Dr. Barth was surprised to find such towns or cities as Kano and Sokoto in the centre of Africa — to discover the focus of a complex and widely ramified commerce, and a busy hive of manufacturing industry, in a region which most people had believed to be a desert. And there are towns and cities nearly as important farther west, to which Barth did not penetrate, affording still scope to extend the horizon of European knowledge and the limits of commercial enterprise. Mr. Benjamin Anderson, the enterprising Liberian traveller, who has recently visited Misodu, the capital of the Western Mandingoes, about two hundred miles east of Monrovia, describes that city as the centre of a considerable commerce, reaching as far north as Senegal and east as far as Sokoto."

The study of Arabic among these Mohammedan Negroes is pursued with great zeal, and the educational acquirements of some of the young men are really remarkable. Accidentally meeting a lad from one of the interior districts, Prof. Blyden gave him an Arabic New Testament, "which he read with unimpeded fluency, and with the Oriental accent and pronunciation." The Koran is studied with as much earnestness and enthusiasm in the large towns of Western and Central Africa, as it is at Cairo or Bagdad.

"In travelling in the exterior of Liberia we have met ulemas, or learned men, who could reproduce from memory any chapter of the Koran, with its vowels and dots and other grammatical marks. The boys under their instruction are kept at the study of the books for years. First they are taught the letters and vowel marks, then they are taught to read the text without receiving any insight into its meaning. When they can read fluently they are taught the meaning of the words, which they commit carefully to memory. Young men who intend to be enrolled among the ulemas take up history and chronology, on which they have some fragmentary manuscripts. Before a student is admitted to the ranks of the learned, he must pass an examination, usually lasting seven days, conducted by a Board consisting of imáms and ulemas. If he is successful, he is led around the town on horseback with instrumental music and singing. After which the candidate is presented with a sash or scarf, usually of fine white cloth of native manufacture, which he is thenceforth permitted to wind round his cap, with one end hanging down the back, forming the Oriental turban. This is a sort of Bachelor of Arts diploma. The men who wear turbans have read and recited the Koran through many hundred times; and you can refer to no passage which they cannot readily find in their apparently confused manuscripts of loose leaves and pages, distinguished not by numbers, but by catch words at the bottom."

Travelling Mohammedan missionaries traverse the country continually from the western coasts to Egypt, Syria and Arabia; and wherever there is an opening they enter and commence the work of conversion; beginning generally with the instruction of the children in Arabic, and the teaching of the precepts of the Koran. In this way the Arabic is penetrating into the interior of Africa; and all across the country there are, as it were, stations connecting the language in one continuous line from the eastern to the western shores. In this way an important preparatory work is already done for the Christian missionary, who, if thoroughly instructed in the Arabic, and able to preach in that tongue, will find the field ready to the har

know, the moment a slave embraces the religion of the Koran, he is a free man. Of course, too, with the conversion of these tribes there comes an end of the barbarous wars carried on in the interests of slavery, and which have so long arrayed the various peoples in hostility to each other, prevented the growth of arts and manufactures, the cultivation of the earth, and those peaceful pursuits which are indispensable to civilization. This alone is a reason for rejoicing in the steady progress of Mohammedanism in the wilds of Africa, looking upon it as an immense advance on heathenism, and the pioneer, as we hope, of Christianity. Prof. Blyden says in the *Methodist Quarterly* for January, from which we borrow most of these facts, that,

"From Senegal to Lagos, over two thousand miles, there is scarcely an important town on the sea-board where there are not at least one mosque and active representatives of Islam, often side by side with the Christian teacher. And as soon as a pagan, however obscure or degraded, embraces the Moslem faith, he is at once admitted as an equal to their society.

The introduction of Islam into Central and West Africa has been the most important, if not the sole, preservative against the desolations of the slave-trade. Mohammedanism furnished a protection to the tribes who embraced it by effectually binding them together in one strong religious fraternity, and enabling them by their united effort to baffle the attempts of powerful pagan slave-hunters. Enjoying this comparative immunity from sudden hostile incursions, industry was stimulated among them; industry diminished their poverty, and as they increased in worldly substance, they also increased in desire for knowledge. Gross superstition gradually disappeared from among them. Receiving a degree of culture from the study of the Arabic language, they acquired loftier views, wider tastes, and those energetic habits which so pleasingly distinguish them from their pagan neighbors.

Large towns and cities have grown up under Mohammedan energy and industry. Dr. Barth was surprised to find such towns or cities as Kano and Sokoto in the centre of Africa — to discover the focus of a complex and widely ramified commerce, and a busy hive of manufacturing industry, in a region which most people had believed to be a desert. And there are towns and cities nearly as important farther west, to which Barth did not penetrate, affording still scope to extend the horizon of European knowledge and the limits of commercial enterprise. Mr. Benjamin Anderson, the enterprising Liberian traveller, who has recently visited Misodu, the capital of the Western Mandingoes, about two hundred miles east of Monrovia, describes that city as the centre of a considerable commerce, reaching as far north as Senegal and east as far as Sokoto."

The study of Arabic among these Mohammedan Negroes is pursued with great zeal, and the educational acquirements of some of the young men are really remarkable. Accidentally meeting a lad from one of the interior districts, Prof. Blyden gave him an Arabic New Testament, "which he read with unimpeded fluency, and with the Oriental accent and pronunciation." The Koran is studied with as much earnestness and enthusiasm in the large towns of Western and Central Africa, as it is at Cairo or Bagdad.

"In travelling in the exterior of Liberia we have met ulemas, or learned men, who could reproduce from memory any chapter of the Koran, with its vowels and dots and other grammatical marks. The boys under their instruction are kept at the study of the books for years. First they are taught the letters and vowel marks, then they are taught to read the text without receiving any insight into its meaning. When they can read fluently they are taught the meaning of the words, which they commit carefully to memory. Young men who intend to be enrolled among the ulemas take up history and chronology, on which they have some fragmentary manuscripts. Before a student is admitted to the ranks of the learned, he must pass an examination, usually lasting seven days, conducted by a Board consisting of imáms and ulemas. If he is successful, he is led around the town on horseback with instrumental music and singing. After which the candidate is presented with a sash or scarf, usually of fine white cloth of native manufacture, which he is thenceforth permitted to wind round his cap, with one end hanging down the back, forming the Oriental turban. This is a sort of Bachelor of Arts diploma. The men who wear turbans have read and recited the Koran through many hundred times; and you can refer to no passage which they cannot readily find in their apparently confused manuscripts of loose leaves and pages, distinguished not by numbers, but by catch words at the bottom."

Travelling Mohammedan missionaries traverse the country continually from the western coasts to Egypt, Syria and Arabia; and wherever there is an opening they enter and commence the work of conversion; beginning generally with the instruction of the children in Arabic, and the teaching of the precepts of the Koran. In this way the Arabic is penetrating into the interior of Africa; and all across the country there are, as it were, stations connecting the language in one continuous line from the eastern to the western shores. In this way an important preparatory work is already done for the Christian missionary, who, if thoroughly instructed in the Arabic, and able to preach in that tongue, will find the field ready to the har

this changing state of things, no one has more surprised and pleased me than the change which has taken place in this country respecting the French. When I saw you they were considered the political saviours of this country. Now they are considered as our adversary the devil, going about seeking to devour us, and are hated as much, and much more, than the devil they are supposed to be under the influence of. This is an amazing revolution. Who could have thought it?

But this is an age of revolutions. I see in the religious world as great revolutions. I was yesterday invited, in a very polite manner, to attend at an ordination in one of the oldest meeting-houses in this town, at which were present the Episcopalians, Baptists, and all others in this place; and a stranger would have found it difficult to have determined which was of the one or of the other denomination, except by his dress. And in this, also, there is now a very great similarity. When I see myself seated in the midst of those who were once my greatest enemies and bitterest persecutors, I am ready to ask, Is it that they are better? or that I am worse? Then I find all the preaching and praying in the same style. They are all for charity, and ever thanking God for condescending to become the Saviour of the world; and praying with real or apparent devotion for the expected day, when the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, whom to know is life eternal, and the kingdoms of the world be the kingdom of Christ Jesus. So that, in fact, were you to form a judgment of them by their preaching, and especially by their praying, you would conclude them all as great Universalists as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and all the holy prophets from the beginning of the world were. Think you, that when I sit and hear them thus confirm my once despised testimony, I do not feel more than I can express, especially when many in the congregation throw their eyes on me, as if they would say, This is like you? When I was confined with pain and sore distress, these reverend doctors came to see me in the kindest manner, calling me their brother, and sympathizing with me. One indeed, and only one, of the clergy in this place, I am informed, was heard to say that he hoped I never should recover. The clergyman who gave me this information assured me it was a fact; for I doubted his *saying* so much. But I did not and do not think the worse of him for it. I doubt not he would think he did God service in killing me. But it is astonishing how few there are of this disposition in the present day. Whatever may be the cause

the effect is to me most pleasing, though in some respects I should gain more by persecution. However, I have the pleasure to live in peace. I am in the habit of friendly sociability with my Father's children. I can now take them by the hand, as I always wished to do, as brethren.

I am now charmingly situated in a most delightful part of the town. I have as many of the comforts of life as I can comfortably enjoy, with the blessed prospect of a glorious immortality; so that, in fact, were it not for pain of body, and some vexations of mind, and, above all, for this plague of the heart, which is a perpetual plague to me, and will be as long as I remain in this house of my earthly tabernacle, in the walls of which this plague is, I should be content to tarry where I am. But, everything considered, I am very ready to depart and be with Christ, in whose presence is fulness of joy, because nothing that defileth can ever enter there. . . .

Your ever affectionate friend, JOHN MURRAY.

GENERAL REVIEW.

The Moabite Stone.

OUR readers will remember that we called attention, in the *Quarterly* for October, 1870, to the discovery of the important monument known as the "Moabite Stone." The discovery has attracted general attention from antiquarians and Biblical students. Several treatises have already appeared in English, French and German. The circumstances of its finding are singularly interesting. In August, 1868, an attaché of the French Consulate, at Jerusalem, M. Ganneau, was informed that there existed near the eastern shores of the Dead Sea, the Ancient Moab, a block of black stone, or marble, covered with inscriptions. Curious to ascertain what it could be, and the character of the writing, he employed a young and intelligent Arab to go to the place designated, take measurements, and obtain an impression on paper prepared for the purpose.[1] He had nearly accomplished his

[1] The stone is thirty-nine inches high, twenty inches wide, and the same in thickness; of heavy black basalt; in the shape of an ordinary grave-stone.

purpose when there arose a quarrel among the Bedouins, who had somehow come to know that Europeans were interested in the monument, and that it was of great value. The quarrel respected the ownership of the stone. Happily the young Arab had presence of mind enough in the midst of the *mélée* to snatch the half-finished impression from the stone, and, springing upon his horse, he escaped with only a spear wound in the leg.

Subsequently the Bedouins, by the aid of fire and water, broke the precious monument into several pieces, thinking to sell these to the Franks for more than they could obtain for the stone entire. About two-thirds of these pieces, containing six hundred and sixty-nine letters out of one thousand, have been purchased by M. Ganneau, and are now in Jerusalem. Impressions have been taken of all these pieces, and, together with that obtained before the breakage, have been published in *fac simile* in the "Revue Archæologique."

In the "Bibliotheca Sacra" for October, 1870, the original, Hebrew, and a translation are given, and in "Jerusalem Recovered," just issued by D. Appleton & Co., we have three other translations, two by Ganneau, and that by Prof. Schlottmann. Believing that our readers will be glad to see this ancient writing, we give place to one of these translations. It will be remembered that this remarkable monument is older than two-thirds of the Old Testament, dating back nine centuries before Christ! and covers the same ground occupied by a portion of the Books of Kings, giving the Moabite history of the struggles between Mesha and the Israelitish kings. The third chapter of 2 Kings furnishes a record of the campaign of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram against this very Mesha, King of Moab.

The words of the original inscription are separated by points, and the sentences by perpendicular lines. In the following translation, the letters in brackets are conjectural readings to fill the place of words destroyed by the breaking of the stone, the spaces corresponding in length with those in the *fac simile*.

"I am Mesha, son of Chemosh [nadab,] King of Moab, [the D-] ibonite. | My father reigned over Moab thirty years, and I reigned after my father. | And I made this high place to Chemosh in Karhah,[2] and this House of Salvation, because he has saved me from all

[2] *Chemosh* was the national deity of the Moabites, as may be seen in Numbers xxi. 29, and particularly in Jeremiah xlviii. 3, 13, 46. Solomon, when going after other gods, introduced his worship into Jerusalem, 1 Kings xi. 7: "Then did Solomon build an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab in the hill before Jerusalem." See also 2 Kings xxiii. Dr Guisburg says that out of twelve or fifteen Moabite cities mentioned in the Old Testament, eleven of them are named in this inscription.

the attacks, and because he has caused me to look on all my enemies. | O [mr] i was King of Israel, and he afflicted Moab many days, because Chemosh was angry with his [land]. | And his son succeeded him, and he also said, "I will afflict Moab." | In my days he spake thus, and I looked on him and on his house, | and Israel kept continually perishing. And Omri held possession of the land (?) of Medeba. And there dwelt in it [Omri and his son and his grand] son forty years. [But] Chemosh [restored] it in my days. | And I built Baal-Meon, and I made in it ———— And I [besieged] (?) Kirjathaim. | And the men of God had dwelt of old in the land [Kirjathaim.] And the King of Israel built for him [Kirjathaim.] | And I fought against the city, and took it. | And I slew all the [men of] the city, a spectacle to Chemosh and to Moab. | And I brought back from thence the [altar of Jehovah, and put] it before Chemosh in Kerioth. | And I caused to dwell therein the men of Shirah; and the men of —— Sharath. | And Chemosh said to me, "Go and take Nebo from Israel." | [And I ——] went in the night, and I fought against it from the overspreading of the dawn till noon. | And I [took it, and I utterly destroyed] it, and I slew all of it, seven thousand ———, for to Ashtor Chemosh had [I] devoted [them,] and I took from thence the vessels of Jehovah, and I presented them before Chemosh. | And the King of Israel [built] Jahaz, and dwelt in it while he was fighting against me. | And Chemosh drove him from [before me; and] I took from Moab two hundred men, all told; | and I attacked (?) Jahaz and took it, joining it to Dibon. | I built Karhah, the wall of the forests, and the wall of the hill (Ophel.) | And I built its gates, and I built its towers. | And I made a royal palace, and I made reservoirs for the collection of the waters in the midst of the city. | And there was no cistern in the midst of the city in Karhah; and I said to all the people, "Make for you each man a cistern in his house." And I dug ditches (?) for Karhah [in the road to] Israel. | I built [A]roer, and I made the high way to Arnon. I built Beth-Bamoth, for it was ruined, | and I built Bozrah, for it was deserted. (?) And I set in Dibon garrisons; (?) for all Dibon was submissive. | And I filled (?) —— in the cities which I added to the land. | And I built —— and the temple of Diblathaim, | and the temple of Baal-Meon, and I raised up there —— —— the land. | And there in Horonaim —— Chemosh said to me, "Go, fight against Horonaim. | And I ———— Chemosh in my days . . . . "

How wonderful that this monument should have been preserved through all the ages — a monument set up, and its inscription cut, near to the time when Solomon was building his temple! Is it not highly probable that more such treasures might be found in the wilderness around the Dead Sea, if thorough exploration were made? And then how like a chapter from the Old Testament this Moabite

narrative reads. Its style, language, names of gods, of kings, and of places, are all the same; and one might easily imagine he was reading a lost chapter from the Book of Chronicles.

Before this discovery there was no proof, outside the Bible itself, of the truth of the record about Mesha and the Moabite war; but it turns out after all that through all these centuries there has been waiting there on the shore of the Dead Sea a witness which could testify directly to the point — if only we had known it — even this record of Mesha himself. How many more such witnesses are, in the providence of God, waiting there, and elsewhere, to be called, who can tell? As Dr. Whedon says, "Such a fragment of Moabite history nine centuries before Christ, suddenly authenticating the minute and obscure thread of Israelite history, is eminently suggestive. It furnishes a brief but very convincing proof that the old Hebrew records are truly contemporary and historical; that they passed through the eastern captivities unmarred; that the Hebrew editors at the restoration were true to their duty, and that our present text is proximately a genuine copy of the primitive documents."

At a recent meeting of the Ethnological Department of the British Association, Dr. Guisburg stated, in a paper on the subject, that

"Respecting the relation of the ancient Moabites to the neighboring nations, he had come to the conclusion that at the period indicated an organized temple-service existed among Jews out of Palestine, and that the service must have been very much akin to the service of the Moabites; that nine hundred years before Christ the word 'Jehovah,' which was afterwards so much avoided by the Jews, was so much upon the lips of every Jew that it passed over to a neighboring nation; that the language of the inscription, which was infinitely more simple than two-thirds of the Old Testament, showed that the Moabites had attained to a high state of cultivation; that in military prowess they were superior to the Jews; and that from them the ancient Greeks and Romans, and we ourselves, had derived what had become our alphabet."

Rejoicing in this discovery, we feel confident that from Judea and the regions round about there are more yet to come. Doubtless Jerusalem has many such treasures buried a hundred feet or more below the surface of her present site, which, it is hoped, the Palestine Exploring Expedition will yet bring to light to the astonishment and edification of an expectant world.

Mohammedanism in Africa.

THE rapid spread of the Arabic language, and the growth of Mohammedanism, in Africa, constitute one of the significant signs of the times. Occasionally we have given paragraphs in the "Religious World," illustrating this, and showing the relation of the two facts to each other. The subject is one of great interest, and is closely connected with the future progress of Christianity among the Negro races in these barbarous realms.

Years ago, in an article on Mohammed, printed in these pages, we had occasion to show the better side of the Arabian prophet, and of his religion as set out in the Koran. It was seen that his mission and teachings were not wholly evil, and that it was no easy matter for an impartial judge to decide whether there was not in the man more of the religious enthusiast than of the imposter. Recent observations and inquiries in Western and Central Africa, among the aboriginal tribes, reveal the fact that the religion of Mohammed, which so largely shapes and controls the character and destiny of more than one hundred and sixty million of men, has within it elements of saving power, and is doing a beneficent work among the converted tribes, and lifting them to a higher civilization, to a level of morality and religious life far above that of the surrounding pagan tribes.

Seventy years ago the moral and social contrast between the Pagan and Mohammedan negroes was observed by Mungo Park everywhere on the line of his travels. The entire absence of all kinds of intoxicating drinks was particularly noticed — the Pagans drinking beer and meed to excess, while the Mohammedan converts drank *nothing but water.* "Thus," says Prof. Blyden, of Liberia College, "throughout Central Africa there has been established a vast *total abstinence society;* and such is the influence of this society that where there are Moslem inhabitants, even in pagan towns, it is a very rare thing to see a person intoxicated. They thus present an almost impenetrable barrier to the desolating flood of ardent spirits with which traders from Europe and America inundate the coast, and of which we have recently had truthful and sadly suggestive accounts from a missionary at Gaboon."

In addition to this important reform in the condition of the Negroes, we have also the momentous fact that Mohammedanism is by its steady work of conversion gradually contracting the territorial limits, and abolishing the institution, of slavery; for, as our readers

know, the moment a slave embraces the religion of the Koran, he is a free man. Of course, too, with the conversion of these tribes there comes an end of the barbarous wars carried on in the interests of slavery, and which have so long arrayed the various peoples in hostility to each other, prevented the growth of arts and manufactures, the cultivation of the earth, and those peaceful pursuits which are indispensable to civilization. This alone is a reason for rejoicing in the steady progress of Mohammedanism in the wilds of Africa, looking upon it as an immense advance on heathenism, and the pioneer, as we hope, of Christianity. Prof. Blyden says in the *Methodist Quarterly* for January, from which we borrow most of these facts, that,

"From Senegal to Lagos, over two thousand miles, there is scarcely an important town on the sea-board where there are not at least one mosque and active representatives of Islam, often side by side with the Christian teacher. And as soon as a pagan, however obscure or degraded, embraces the Moslem faith, he is at once admitted as an equal to their society.

The introduction of Islam into Central and West Africa has been the most important, if not the sole, preservative against the desolations of the slave-trade. Mohammedanism furnished a protection to the tribes who embraced it by effectually binding them together in one strong religious fraternity, and enabling them by their united effort to baffle the attempts of powerful pagan slave-hunters. Enjoying this comparative immunity from sudden hostile incursions, industry was stimulated among them; industry diminished their poverty, and as they increased in worldly substauce, they also increased in desire for knowledge. Gross superstition gradually disappeared from among them. Receiving a degree of culture from the study of the Arabic language, they acquired loftier views, wider tastes, and those energetic habits which so pleasingly distinguish them from their pagan neighbors.

Large towns and cities have grown up under Mohammedan energy and industry. Dr. Barth was surprised to find such towns or cities as Kano and Sokoto in the centre of Africa — to discover the focus of a complex and widely ramified commerce, and a busy hive of manufacturing industry, in a region which most people had believed to be a desert. And there are towns and cities nearly as important farther west, to which Barth did not penetrate, affording still scope to extend the horizon of European knowledge and the limits of commercial enterprise. Mr. Benjamin Anderson, the enterprising Liberian traveller, who has recently visited Misodu, the capital of the Western Mandingoes, about two hundred miles east of Monrovia, describes that city as the centre of a considerable commerce, reaching as far north as Senegal and east as far as Sokoto."

The study of Arabic among these Mohammedan Negroes is pursued with great zeal, and the educational acquirements of some of the young men are really remarkable. Accidentally meeting a lad from one of the interior districts, Prof. Blyden gave him an Arabic New Testament, "which he read with unimpeded fluency, and with the Oriental accent and pronunciation." The Koran is studied with as much earnestness and enthusiasm in the large towns of Western and Central Africa, as it is at Cairo or Bagdad.

"In travelling in the exterior of Liberia we have met ulemas, or learned men, who could reproduce from memory any chapter of the Koran, with its vowels and dots and other grammatical marks. The boys under their instruction are kept at the study of the books for years. First they are taught the letters and vowel marks, then they are taught to read the text without receiving any insight into its meaning. When they can read fluently they are taught the meaning of the words, which they commit carefully to memory. Young men who intend to be enrolled among the ulemas take up history and chronology, on which they have some fragmentary manuscripts. Before a student is admitted to the ranks of the learned, he must pass an examination, usually lasting seven days, conducted by a Board consisting of imáms and ulemas. If he is successful, he is led around the town on horseback with instrumental music and singing. After which the candidate is presented with a sash or scarf, usually of fine white cloth of native manufacture, which he is thenceforth permitted to wind round his cap, with one end hanging down the back, forming the Oriental turban. This is a sort of Bachelor of Arts diploma. The men who wear turbans have read and recited the Koran through many hundred times; and you can refer to no passage which they cannot readily find in their apparently confused manuscripts of loose leaves and pages, distinguished not by numbers, but by catch words at the bottom."

Travelling Mohammedan missionaries traverse the country continually from the western coasts to Egypt, Syria and Arabia; and wherever there is an opening they enter and commence the work of conversion; beginning generally with the instruction of the children in Arabic, and the teaching of the precepts of the Koran. In this way the Arabic is penetrating into the interior of Africa; and all across the country there are, as it were, stations connecting the language in one continuous line from the eastern to the western shores. In this way an important preparatory work is already done for the Christian missionary, who, if thoroughly instructed in the Arabic, and able to preach in that tongue, will find the field ready to the har

vest; without the protracted and painful labor of learning the barbarous dialects of the various Negro tribes, reducing each to a written language, and translating the Scriptures into it.

In addition to this, many of the most disgusting practices of their heathen condition have already been abandoned by the converted tribes, and the Christian missionary will find his labor greatly lightened in this direction.

But above all, Mohammedanism has smitten down and destroyed the horrible and revolting idolatry which reigned among these tribes, and established them in the faith of one Supreme God, who is a spirit, and is to be worshipped accordingly. What an immense work is done here; and what vantage ground it gives to the Christian teacher! Truly says a writer, quoted in the article already mentioned, and from which we would be glad to quote more —

"Whatever may have been the influence of Mohammedanism on races in other parts of the world, I think here, upon the African, results will prove it to be merely preparatory to a Christian civilization. In this country, and almost immediately in our vicinity, it has recovered millions from paganism, without, I think, having such a grasp upon the minds of the masses as to lead them obstinately to cling to it in preference to Christianity, with its superior advantages. The same feelings which led them to abandon their former religion for the Moslem will, no doubt, lead them still further, and induce them to embrace ours when properly presented. I express this opinion the more readily from several interviews I have had lately with prominent parties connected with some of these tribes."

The Black Hole of Calcutta.

EVERY one has heard of the Black Hole of Calcutta. The name is black with horror; it is the symbol of all that is fearful in suffering and fiendish in cruelty.

The Nabob of Bengal, Surajah Dowlah, had hated the English from a child. He resolved to drive them from his country, and with a great army marched against Fort-William. The governor and commandant, who were miserable cowards, fled on his approach. After a feeble resistance the fort was taken, with many English prisoners. "Then and there," says Macaulay, "was committed that great crime, memorable for its singular atrocity, memorable for the tremendous retribution by which it was followed."

The prison was known by the fearful name of the Black Hole.

It was twenty feet square — the air-holes were small and choked. Even for a single European that dungeon would have been too small in such a climate. It was in the dead heat of summer, when with all appliances of fans and draughts, in the largest halls, the heat is almost intolerable to the natives of England. Into this small and horrible place one hundred and forty-six prisoners were forced by the bayonet, and the door shut and locked upon them.

Nothing in history or fiction approaches the horrors of that night, as recounted by the survivors. They cried for mercy, strove to burst the door, to tear out the bars of the loop-hole. They offered large bribes — they sought in every possible way to touch the hearts of their guards. They were told there was nothing for them but to remain there all night — that the Nabob was asleep, and would not be disturbed. Then, says the historian,

"The prisoners went mad with despair. They trampled each other down, fought for the places at the windows, fought for the pittance of water with which the cruel mercy of the murderers mocked their agonies — they raved, prayed, blasphemed, implored their guards to fire among them. The jailers in the mean time held lights to the bars, and shouted with laughter at the frantic struggles of their victims.

"At length, as the night wore on, the awful tumult died away into low gasps and moanings. The day broke, light came on, and the Nabob allowed the door to be opened. But it was some time before the soldiers could make a lane for the survivors by piling up the heaps of corpses on either side, on which the burning heat of the climate had already begun to do work of corruption. When at length a passage was made, twenty-three ghastly figures, such as their own mothers would not have known, staggered one by one out of that charnel-house. One hundred and twenty-three out of one hundred and forty-six had perished! A pit was instantly dug — and the corpses flung in and covered up."

Horrible as is the cruelty of this Indian ruler, and ferocious and shocking as is the revenge he took of his enemies; if the popular theology be correct, this is precisely the line of conduct which God will adopt toward his enemies, — only his vengeance will be as much more terrible as the power and wrath of the great God are beyond those of a Hindoo rajah — as much more terrible as the torments of eternity exceed those of a single summer night!

Those believing this theology are not accustomed to look at it from this side; do not often make these comparisons. They read of the Rajah Dowlah with horror in their hearts, and maledictions on their

lips; they read of the Black Hole of Calcutta with faintness and shuddering, their whole being in revolt against such a monster of inhumanity. And yet all this while they are holding to a creed, the God of which is infinitely more cruel in the vengeance with which he visits all his enemies — in a creed which announces a hell, before the terrors and tortures of which the Black Hole of Calcutta sinks below mention, and is not worthy a single thought.

These are not words,-but facts, naked, stubborn, against which no protestations, no cry of impiety or misrepresentation will have the least weight. If the doctrine of endless torment is true under any circumstances, if this is the disposition which God makes of his enemies, if this is the way in which he hates those who hate him, and curses those who curse him — then what we have said is simply and terribly true, and no show of holy horror will alter the case one iota. It were better and wiser to look the facts in the face, and see what is to be done with them — or rather with the doctrine.

The cruelty and fierce revenge of the rajah was frightful enough — but then he was a *man*, full of weakness and passion, and his country had suffered great wrongs from his enemies. He was a heathen; he had never read the Sermon on the Mount; knew nothing of Jesus or his religion of forgiveness and love, of good for evil, and blessing for cursing. It is not so strange then for this fierce savage to take his fell revenge.

But God, whose wrath is so much more dreadful, whose vengeance against his enemies is so much more awful in itself, and endless beside — he is all wisdom, and without weakness or temptation; above all injury from man; and, more than all, he commands us to "love our enemies"; and yet he will take this dire vengeance on those who offend against him; he will drive his enemies into the great prison of hell — compared with which the Black Hole of Calcutta was a paradise — and to which there will come no morning, no opening of the door at last, no death to end their terrific suffering and despair! And while we are called upon to shrink away with disgust from the Hindoo tyrant, we are expected to love and adore and glorify this God with all our hearts!!

The bare statement of such propositions is a sufficient demonstration of their falsehood. And it is a marvel that a theology so shocking in its absurdity, so revolting to the best affections of our nature, can command the faith or respect of any person of reflectio. feeling.

The Sandwich Islands and Foreign Missions.[1]

We cordially welcome the volume, whose title is given below, as a fresh and very valuable contribution to the Evidences for Christianity. It is a comprehensive history of the triumphs of the Gospel — even when largely shorn of its power by being yoked with church creeds — over the degraded, sanguinary and revolting abominations of heathenism as found in the Pacific Islands. It is a new chapter in the great volume of Christian Missions, of which the religious revolution in Madagascar is another, equally eloquent and surprising as a witness to the saving power of Divine Truth. A nobler theme could not be found, and a more fitting person for its just and intelligent treatment does not live than Dr. Anderson, who has been for more than forty years associated with the American Board of Foreign Missions. The story he tells us here is remarkable alike for the providential circumstances under which the Mission was commenced; for the zeal and industry of the first laborers; for the gradual triumph, now over idolatrous influences and forces, now over the violence of licentious English and American sailors and sea-captains, and again over the machinations and insolent claims of France and Catholicism; for the wonderful growth of the churches and for the final establishment of the united islands as a Christian kingdom.

We commend to our clergy, and to all our readers, the history of this most astonishing regeneration of a pagan people; this lifting them up from the very lowest depths of a sensual and cruel idolatry to the acknowledgement and enjoyment of the Christian religion; from the most disgusting and shocking barbarism, as horrible as anything in the wilds of Africa, to the education, the social culture, the domestic virtues, the privileges and blessings of a Christian civilization. They will find in it additional cause for honoring and loving the Gospel of Christ, and new and potent replies to the rationalistic babble of those who count in Jesus with Socrates and Plato, and pronounce Webster's Dictionary as truly inspired as the Sermon on the Mount. And they will find also good reason for honoring our Orthodox brethren for the zeal, liberality and persistent courage with which they have followed up this grand missionary work from its inauguration in 1820 to its completion in 1870, a period of fifty years.

[1] *A Heathen Nation Evangelized.* History of the Sandwich Islands Mission. By Rufus Anderson, D. D., LL. D., Late Foreign Secretary of the Board. Boston: Congregational Publishing Society.

And this conversion of the Sandwich Islands affords us an opportunity to say a word regarding the missionary spirit and operations of the so-called Orthodox sects. They certainly have great difficulties to contend with in the character of their doctrines, and the conflict between these and the humane and liberal spirit of the age. But somehow they contrive to live and flourish in spite of all obstacles. The reason is obvious — they are thoroughly in earnest; they live not for themselves alone, but for others; they are not satisfied with a selfish prosperity, each society content to fill its own church, and then go to sleep, utterly indifferent to the religious condition and welfare of all the rest of the world. The parable of the rich glutton does not apply to them, for they never say, in word or act, "We have much goods laid up for many years; let us take our ease, eat, drink and be merry."

We do not discuss now the truth or falsehood of their doctrines; but at all events they act as if they believed them true, and were profoundly anxious to save their fellow-men from the torments of hell. This volume shows that they are living daily in obedience to this conviction. The poorest society among them, the poorest man of them all, is doing *something* for the salvation of others. All over the land we see their agents scattering tracts and religious books, carrying Bibles and Testaments into every house destitute of them, visiting families, praying, counselling, and conversing on religious subjects. Everywhere, from Canada to Texas, from Maine to California, this work is going on; and there are those willing to enter on the work, and those willing to give for its support, for the love of man only.

And then look at the stupendous operations of the foreign missionary societies, as partly set out in this book — Asia, Africa, Europe, and the Pacific islands, witnessing to their liberality, their energy, and their generous devotion to the religious welfare and salvation of "the heathen, and the uttermost parts of the earth."

Now what is it, reader, to these people individually, or in their society and church relations, whether these pagans are made acquainted with the Gospel or not? What is it personally to your orthodox friend and neighbor whether or not some savage of the Sandwich Islands, or some stupid Hindoo idolater, is converted to Christianity? What difference will it make in his business or his profits? What physical comfort will it add to his family? In what possible way will it benefit him? Yet he gives his dollar to the missionary enter-

prise, and his wife gives, and his children all throw in their mites — and are the happier for it. Yes, they give, and are happier for it; though they never expect to see the distant savage, or the degraded idolater, who may be spiritually redeemed by their offering of Christian sympathy and brotherly love. Certainly, this is always the case. This is the promise of God, and the reward of obedience to the great commandment — "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It is a noble action, it is Christian in the broadest definition of the term, thus to link one's self, his family, with people at the ends of the earth.

When we live for others, we enlarge the sphere of our own life and happiness; when we live for ourselves alone, we contract it, and our happiness is poor and mean.

No society can expect God's blessing, if its members rest satisfied with its own welfare, with having its pews all let, and its expenses all paid; and, selfishly folding up their arms, go to sleep over their prosperity, never waking to any active employment of their means of doing good. Sooner or later their fancied strength departs, their prosperity dwindles, the multitudes who flocked to their doors leave them for warmer hearts and a more generous treatment. And at last, zeal gone, love gone, numbers reduced, failing to improve their opportunities, to fulfill the promise of their beginning, and secure and render permanent the prosperity which was created — at last they awake to the fact that they must live for others as well as for themselves, must obey the Christian law of love, must have some generous purpose in their religious action, must cultivate some human sympathy for the world. In a word, every society, every denomination, must be spiritually alive, must aim at life and activity beyond itself, must have some generous interest in the great world of mankind, must help to "preach the Gospel to every creature," according to the Master's command, or it cannot have part in the promised blessing.

Lost Books.

LATELY scholars and antiquarians have had occasion to mourn over the partial destruction by Prussian siege guns of the Library of Strasbourg, including some valuable manuscripts, and books dating back almost to the beginning of the art of printing. Literature and learning have often suffered sorely through the unsparing devastations of war. The famous Library of Alexandria, founded by Pto-

lemy Soter, and said to contain from 400,000 to 700,000 volumes, mostly perished in the siege of the city by Julius Cæsar. This collection, embracing the gathered literature of India, Egypt, Greece and Rome, the value of which it is impossible to over-estimate, was deposited in the Museum, which was burned. Another portion of this Library, which had been placed in the temple of Serapis, escaped; and to this was afterward added the celebrated collection of Pergamos, presented by Antony to Cleopatra. Thus replenished, the Library continued until the time of Thedosius the Great, who ordered the destruction of all the heathen temples A. D. 391, when the Serapeion was attacked by a fanatical mob of Christians led on by the Archbishop, and the magnificent structure, and probably the greater part of its treasures, were destroyed together. Whatever was left of this once incomparable and priceless collection probably perished at the taking of Alexandria by the Caliph Omar, A. D. 642. The foolishly exaggerated story respecting this event, however, is not to be believed.

The valuable Libraries gathered by the Greeks and Romans of course were given up to destruction as so much worthless trash by the northern barbarians, when they broke in upon the empire, and swept into wreck and ruin the culture and refinement, the treasures and the splendors, of the ancient civilizations. No one can tell the measureless loss to the world by these repeated desolations in the realm of literature; but it is enough to make every lover of learning and books weep, when he thinks of what Philosophy, Science, Theology and History have suffered by the destruction of these hundreds of thousands of volumes, in which were embalmed the thought, the investigations, the intellectual life and labors of so many centuries of the now truly dead past — dead beyond the possibility of a resurrection.

But it is not war alone that has brought such losses to the world. Incalculable destruction of books and manuscripts is to be charged to the unpardonable ignorance and neglect of those having charge of them. We have not space at present to enter upon this at length, but at another time we may give some details respecting the literary wealth that is to-day perishing in the cells and cellars of the monasteries of Mount Athos and the East, and in all manner of out-of-the-way places. Now and then a priceless manuscript is snatched from complete annihilation by some devoted missionary or scholar, as in

the case of the Sinaitic Manuscript; but where one is saved, hundreds perish. We give as an example the following regarding the library of an Oriental monastery, as related by Hon. Robert Cuzon:

"On my inquiring for the library I was told that it had been destroyed. It had formerly been preserved in the great square tower or keep, which is a grand feature in all the monasteries. I went to the place, and leaning through a ruined arch, I looked down into the lower story of the tower, and there I saw the melancholy remains of a once famous library. This was a dismal spectacle for a devout lover of old books. It was indeed a heart-rending sight. By the dim light which streamed through the opening of an iron door in the wall of the ruined tower, I saw above a hundred ancient manuscripts lying among the rubbish which had fallen from the upper floor, which was ruinous, and had in great part given way. Some of these manuscripts seemed quite entire, — fine large folios; but the monks said they were unapproachable, for that floor on which they lay was unsafe, the beams below being rotten from the wet and rain which came in through the roof.

Here was a trap ready set and baited for a bibliographical antiquary. I peeped at the old manuscripts, looked particularly at one or two that were lying in the middle of the floor, and could hardly resist the temptation. I advanced cautiously along the boards, keeping close to the wall, whilst every now and then a dull cracking noise warned me of my danger; but I tried each board by stamping upon it with my foot before I ventured my weight upon it. At last, when I dared go no farther, I made them bring me a long stick, with which I fished up two or three fine manuscripts, and poked them along towards the door.

When I had safely landed them, I examined them more at my ease; but I found that the rain had washed the outer leaves quite clean — the pages were stuck tight together into a solid mass, and when I attempted to open them, they broke short off in square bits like a biscuit. Neglect and damp and exposure had destroyed them completely. One fine volume, a large folio in double columns, of venerable antiquity, particularly grieved me. I was unable to save even a scrap from this general tomb of a whole race of books."

Religious World.

The Roman correspondent of the *Pall Mall* states that the Ultramontanes are very active, and prosecuting with great energy their plans for the expulsion of the Italians from the Eternal City. A central committee has been formed, which guides and controls the committees which are alleged to have been constituted in every coun-

try in Christendom. The object of all this organization is to bring the greatest possible pressure to bear upon the various governments. The restoration of the temporal power "is to be the object of Catholics at all elections and in every political movement, and they are even to league with revolutionists where such a course will strengthen their hands."

On the other hand, we find that among the petitions lately presented to the Italian Chamber of Deputies was one signed by eight thousand five hundred persons demanding the repeal of the statute which declares the Catholic religion to be the religion of the State. Signor Macchi, who had charge of the petition, declared that this statute was an anomaly for a nation which was striving more and more to realize the principle of a Free Church in a free State, and he regarded it as an embarrassment alike to the government and to the people.

— *Charles Scribner & Co.* announce for publication during this month (April) the first volume of the long-looked-for "Speaker's Commentary." It will embrace the entire Pentateuch, filling nearly one thousand pages, giving critical and explanatory notes, and a revision of the translation. This is the most important Biblical work of the century, and has been waited for with great impatience, having been projected as far back as 1863. *Thirty-six of the most eminent scholars and theologians of England* are engaged upon it — selected by a committee appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons (hence the name), and the Archbishop of York. On its appearance we shall give our readers a brief history of the work.

— A stranger pundit has appeared in Benares, the chief city of Hindoo idolatry, who preaches that the sacred books give no sanction to the worship of idols. Crowds attend on him, and the learned find it difficult to answer him. This is another of the many signs of dissatisfaction with the old religions, and is prophetic of the coming in of a revolution which will finally overthrow every form of idolatry, and release the millions of India from the curse of paganism. Dr. Kingsley, late Bishop in the Methodist Church, in his book "Round the World," has the following in regard to the changes going on with the more intelligent and educated classes among the Hindoos and Mohammedans respecting the authority of their several religions. It shows that the world is steadily moving forward, and that the way

is slowly opening for the universal reign of Christ; for the incoming of that era when the Lord will "destroy the covering cast over the face of all people, and the vail that is spread over all nations":

"It is easy to see that both Hindoo idolatry and Mohammedanism are losing their hold on the minds of those who still show them an outward deference. I have talked with intelligent Hindoos, with the red paint on their foreheads, indicating that they had faithfully attended to their religious rites, who, nevertheless, told me they had no faith in these mummeries, and felt the heathen yoke that was upon them an intolerable burden; deploring caste, and mourning over the degraded condition of their women. They will do utter violence to their doctrine of caste when it can be done without exposure. I speak now of many of the more intelligent among them. Mohammedans have made similar confessions to me, saying they felt at liberty, so far as any conscientious scruples were concerned, to violate the requirements of that religion. Besides all this, there seems to be a sort of foreboding in regard to many particulars that their ancient religion is about worn out. One is, that after about thirty years more the sacred Ganges will lose its virtue. The day is dawning on India. May the Sun of Righteousness, with healing in his beams, soon rise upon her!"

—The following paragraph from "Why and How," noticed in the last *Quarterly*, referring to the religious belief of the lower classes of Chinese, will give our readers one phase of modern heathenism, respecting which and Chinese "Spiritualism," they will find much more in chapter xiii. on "Consulting the Gods."

"It keeps the soul in constant alarm and loads the mind with care. When combined with the other Coolie ideas, that the heavens, the earth, the sea, the sky, paradise and hell are filled with wrangling, fickle, avaricious gods, whose only occupation is to fight over the disposition that shall be made of man here, and his soul hereafter, it becomes doubly terrible. Then the beasts, the birds, the fish, the reptiles and the insects are supposed to contain the souls of future generations, or of the generation that is past. To really believe that his deceased grandmother is a cow, his grandfather an alligator, his little sister a codfish, his father a buffalo, and his mother in Hades wandering about in starvation alone, because he has no means to purchase and burn 'mock money' to supply her necessities, is as terrible and harassing to the believer as it is ridiculous to us. His life is a state of fear. Blue devils hold dire calamities over his head at night, and white-robed imps repeat the threatenings by day.

He will be punished by one god if he does an act, and scourged by another if he does it not. All his time for devotion is used in appeasing the wrath of the angry gods. Yet if he pays any respect to one

and not the same to the others, there will be a jealous war in the abode of the gods, the result of which will be a combined attack upon the defenceless worshipper. Merit seems to have little or nothing to do with the question; and if the devotee has nothing of his own with which to keep these gods quiet, he must steal something to offer them, and after he has stolen the sacrifice he is kept in constant fear lest the gods go and tell the mandarin of the peculation, and have him punished."

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

1. The Conspiracy of Pontiac, and the Indian War after the Conquest of Canada. By Francis Parkman. Sixth Edition, Revised, with Additions. 2 vols. Little, Brown & Company.

Our readers are already familiar with the high estimate in which we hold the historical labors of Mr. Parkman, as expressed in previous notices of his "Pioneers of France in the New World," "The Jesuits in North America," and the "Discovery of the Great West," which we count among the most instructive and pleasing volumes in our library. And to these we now add the work named above, which in value, interest and attractive narrative may be justly counted as taking precedence of them all.

On its first appearance, years ago, the author immediately took rank among our best writers, and the book was welcomed by critical judges at home and abroad as a most valuable contribution to American historical literature. In this sixth edition large portions of the work have been rewritten, and many very interesting and important additions made from a mass of correspondence which has recently been added to the British Museum, consisting of several hundred letters of officers serving in the Pontiac War, giving curious and graphic sketches of persons and events, and sharp criticisms of military plans and movements.

In this, as in his previous volumes, Mr. Parkman discovers to us his industrious researches among original authorities, and his critical ability in sifting their statements, reconciling their contradictions, and drawing out a clear, concise and reliable narrative of one of the most important episodes in our colonial history. In this respect the book reminds us of Prescott's "Conquest of Mexico"; and in its delightful descriptions of river, lake and forest scenery, of Indian encampments, life and manners, we see again many of the charming pictures of Irving's "Astoria," "Tour on the Prairies," and "Bonneville's Adventures." And for this work no man is better fitted than Mr.

Parkman, having prepared himself by actual camp life among the Western Indians, and by a personal inspection of the localities which he paints in such fresh and glowing colors.

Pontiac, the hero of the narrative, belonged to that class of Indians represented by Philip, Blackhawk, and others; chiefs who clearly foresaw the fate which threatened their race, and sought by a league of all the tribes, and a general onslaught, to avert it and drive the English from the land. Here began his Conspiracy and the terrible war which followed, and which desolated the whole frontier, and was marked by treachery, ingratitude, cruelties and atrocities, which might put a fiend to the blush. Pontiac, confessedly, was a chief of great executive abilities, clear-sighted, persistent, exerting a wonderful influence over his own and surrounding tribes, and admirably fitted every way for a leader; but after all he was a thorough Indian, false, treacherous, unscrupulous, ferocious and brutal in all his instincts. Mr. Parkman apologizes for him, but the story itself is his condemnation — though of course we do not forget that he is to be judged by the Indian standard, and not by ours.

The Introductory chapter is a condensed sketch of the Indian character and manners, their government, political relations, and superstitions. Then follows an account of the French and English in America, their rivalry and conflicts, and the growth of the English power in the West; the jealousy and fears of the Indians regarding their future, the conspiracy of Pontiac, the siege of Detroit, the capture and destruction of the frontier forts, the massacre at Michillimackinac, the attempted rally and league of the Western tribes, the final ruin of the Indian cause, and the assassination of Pontiac.

One of the interesting portions of the work is that occupied with an account of the lawless outbreak by the "Paxton Men," the murder of the friendly Indians, and the march of the rioters on Philadelphia. Whether the difficult problem of responsibility and guilt in that unhappy affair is settled by Mr. Parkman, we cannot say — but as much so, probably, as it ever will be now.

We must confess to a considerable change of feeling in regard to the Indian question within the last few years, and we must credit it in part to Mr. Parkman's books. We can pardon something to the Indian when the conflict is between him and the white man, from whom he has suffered so many and great wrongs;[1] but when his

[1] And some idea of these wrongs, and of the unscrupulous means employed for their destruction, may be gathered from the following extracts from letters by Gen. Amherst and Col. Bouquet. They will remind the reader of a like enterprise attempted by the rebel leaders during our late war. Gen. A. writes to Col. Bouquet:

"Could it not be contrived to send the *Small Pox* among those disaffected tribes of Indians? We must on this occasion use every stratagem in our power to reduce them." To which Col. Bouquet replies: "I will try to inoculate the —— with some blankets that may fall into their hands, and take care not to get the disease myself." To this Amherst rejoined: "You will do well to try to inoculate the Indians by blankets, as well as to try every other method that can serve to extirpate this execrable race."

ferocity is exhibited toward those of his own race, it does not admit of this explanation or excuse. And if the reader will follow the Iroquois in their wars of extermination against the Algonquin tribes, if he will read "The Jesuits in North America," the narrative of the destruction of The Illinois in "Discovery of the Great West," or any reliable account of the "Sioux War and Massacre" a few years ago, we think he will not greatly differ from us. We know of nothing so horrible in the annals of human cruelty and suffering, as the record of the extermination of the Hurons by their brethren, the Iroquois; and the utterly devilish ferocity with which they would start off on snow-shoes hundreds of miles into the Canada forests, in the depth of winter, to hunt up a company of half-starved, half-frozen women and children and old men — who had fled into the wilderness to escape their fury — that they might have the pleasure of torturing them to death. But we will not extend these remarks.

2. A Denominational Offering: From the Literature of Universalism. In Twelve Parts. By Rev. Norris C. Hodgdon. Universalist Publishing House.

We mentioned this work in our last, and return to it now to say, that it is a most excellent and useful volume for distribution among the ever-increasing class who wish to know more of the doctrines, moral aims and aspects, the spiritual and regenerating forces of Universalism as a belief, and as a church or religious organism. It contains citations from more than one hundred and thirty of our preachers and writers, beside extracts from our periodicals, on Universalism as a creed, a sentiment, an organized power; its history, its relations to Unitarianism, its progress and present position, its worth, utility, working capacity, and popularity; its foundation in Scripture and reason, its practical fruits, its sustaining power in affliction, sickness and death. It is a book in which Universalism is allowed to speak for itself, to state its own case, and declare the motive and object of its pulpit and literature in earnestly laboring for its promulgation among men. It cannot fail to do good among all sincere and honest inquirers after truth; and it will be found also a welcome guest with those who, though established in the faith, are glad to refresh themselves with the thoughts of our best thinkers and writers.

3. Robert Falconer. By George Macdonald, LL. D., author of "David Elginbrod," etc. Loring, Publisher, Boston.

We count this as among the best books we have read for years. It is far more than a mere story, though in this respect it has great power and attraction. The characters, particularly Falconer and Ericson, are drawn with wonderful skill and insight, and win alike the admiration, pity and affection of the reader. It is impossible not to be painfully and tenderly interested in Ericson, so manly in sentiment, so spiritual in his aspirations, yet fighting daily with his doubts and unbelief, striving for faith, but at the last passing under the cloud with no ray of light, but hoping, and going to see for himself what *there is* beyond.

And then Falconer, from his childhood, battling against the savage, cast-iron creed of endless damnation, nearly driven into the same wilderness of Atheism, but at last struggling out of the nightmare of this horrible dogma into a more Christian belief; gradually won to it from the goodness he finds in human hearts, the beneficence and beauty he finds in nature, the fellowship of Jesus, and his merciful Gospel, specially that ever-memorable Sermon on the Mount. No one who had not himself passed through this dark and troubled experience, and fought out the doubtful battle to final victory, could describe it with such power and feeling. No one who had not felt the burden of this awful dogma, could set it forth in such strong and earnest words.

It is curious that a writer of such works, one of such pronounced Universalism, and seeing no other solution of the problem of evil but its final abolition, should be commended so highly by the "North British Review," the organ of Scotch Orthodoxy, by "The Independent," "Lippincott's Magazine," etc. It is only another proof of the sure disintegrating force of theological and religious thought acting on the old creeds. As the last-named journal says, "Would that many a soul struggling for the light, sadly despairing or content in hostile prejudice, might, reading this book, renew the experience of Falconer, who, educated under the influence of the sternest type of Scottish theology, and tormented, thence, with many doubts, finds a refuge, at last, from doubts and formulas alike in the living presence of his Lord and Master!"

Then there is the old grandmother, with a heart full of human tenderness, who would willingly be damned in the place of her vile but still loved son, striving conscientiously and in obedience to her faith to crush out her mother's love, and say "Thy will be done," and failing utterly. What a prayer is that which she utters in her anguish! and what a smiting blow upon her terrible creed!

But there is yet another feature in this book which ought to secure it a reading at the hand of all philanthropists, and especially of those who are so anxious to escape individual labor and responsibility through organized charities. The practical suggestions regarding the methods of Christian work among the outcast and the poor, the dangerous and perishing classes, are worthy of much serious thought. We believe in organization, but we believe more in such individualism as we find in Falconer, and Dr. Anderson, and Mary St. John. We think Mr. Hale must have read this book before he wrote "Ten Times One are Ten." The germ of it is here. No club, no society, no constitution — but the work was done.

4. Other Worlds than Ours: The Plurality of Worlds studied under the Light of Recent Scientific Researches. By Richard A. Proctor, B. A., F. R. A. S. D. Appleton & Co.

The reader will find in this volume all that is really known of the physical character and condition of the planets, primary and secondary, which compose our solar system. He will get from it, in a com-

pact and readable form, the reliable results of scientific observations of these distant worlds, observations by the most profound and careful astronomers, extending through a long series of years, and made from all parts of the earth's surface.

Mr. Proctor is a diligent and enthusiastic student of astronomy, exact in his observations, patient in his mathematical inquiries, somewhat inclined to speculate, always, however, on the basis of well-ascertained facts, and writing with a facile pen which enables him to set out his argument in a way to attract and interest his readers whether learned or unlearned. We find him at times in conflict with Herschell, Lardner and others, but always with a good show of cause for dissent. If we follow his lead we must give up the moon's habitability, and look upon Jupiter and Saturn as not yet fitted up in a way to invite our long stay if we should go there — for which we are sorry, as we have always counted upon a visit to these magnificent worlds as among the highest privileges and enjoyments of the Hereafter. Though it may be that to visit a world and watch the processs of its formation, to see it built up by degrees into a habitable condition, will have as much interest and instruction as to see it in its completed state. Mars, however, and perhaps others of the lesser planets, are already inhabitable and inhabited.

But it is not of the solar system alone that the author treats. Other suns and stars, the Constellations and the Nebulæ, come in for examination, and the last results of telescopic investigation and spectroscopic analysis are given us, showing what wonderful progress has been made in our study of the heavens within the last few years.

5. Essays written in the Intervals of Business. To which is added An Essay on Organization in Daily Life. By Arthur Helps, author of "Friends in Council," &c. Roberts Brothers.

This is another of those books from Helps, crisp, clear, compact in thought and utterance, full of good sense and practical wisdom, which have given him such an enviable reputation. It is a volume for all classes; but especially for those who would be thorough business men, and those who are ambitious of directing in public affairs. The Essay on "Organization in Daily Life" is one of those admirable, common-sense, suggestive essays, from which every man and woman may get something helpful in the general conduct of life; while the pieces on "Advice," "The Education of a Man of Business," "On the Transaction of Business," "Of Councils, Commissions, and Bodies of Men called together to Counsel or Direct," and "Conversation in a Railway Carriage," are full of useful hints and sound advice which every day will call into requisition. We commend the book to all our business friends.

6. Synchronology of the Principal Events in Sacred and Profane History, from the Creation of Man to the Present Time. Compiled from the most Authentic Sources. By Stephen Hawes. Third Revised Edition. Lee & Shepard.

The fact that this work has gone to a third edition is good proof of

its usefulness, and of its being used. It is a condensed history of the world, in the regular order of events, intended for the use of students, editors and literary men generally. It is exceedingly convenient, and a great time-saver. It differs from Hayden's "Dictionary of Dates," which is alphabetical in its arrangement of subjects, while this is chronological, giving each event under its proper year, and in the 11th and 12th Periods of Part II., the month and day of the month, which has its special advantages. This will be readily seen in the historical and chronological sequence of events during the Rebellion.

But in addition to this we have thirty-three Index Tables giving the succession of Rulers in all the kingdoms and empires of the world, ancient and modern; a "Biographical Index"; a "Battle Index"; and a "Historical Chart," borrowed from Putnam's "World's Progress," which at a glance gives the geographical extent of each kingdom from century to century. We regret that the author did not also take from Putnam the "Literary Chronology," one of its most useful features, and add to his "Biographical Index" the brief explanations given by Putnam, and the date of birth and death. The dates attached now represent sometimes one, and sometimes the other, and sometimes neither, greatly to the confusion of one who is in a hurry. A note explaining the use of the asterisk in this Index would not be out of place.

7. Books and Reading; or, What Books shall I read, and How shall I read them? By Noah Porter, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Yale College. Charles Scribner & Co.

A most useful volume for professional men and students of every description, but specially so for those young men who wish to educate themselves. Clerks, book-keepers, salesmen, mechanics, who have not the means for a collegiate course, but are nevertheless determined, by a thorough course of reading in history, science and general literature, to prepare themselves for a wider sphere of activity and usefulness, will find this book an invaluable assistant. It will save them much time and inquiry, and many inevitable mistakes in the selection of works suited to their purpose. Beside this, the author, eminently qualified by his experience in teaching and a wide range of reading, offers many practical suggestions as to *how* we should read; a very important thing with the class of whom we speak. It is not the number of books a man reads which develops and educates him, but the judgment and discrimination with which he reads them, and his capacity for digestion and assimilation.

It is exactly twenty years since we prepared for the pages of this *Quarterly* "A Course of Historical Reading," confined to American books or American editions; and now as we look over the chapter of Prof. Porter bearing the same title, we see with unalloyed pleasure how immensely the Book-world has been enriched since then by new works, and American editions and translations of foreign works.

We heartily welcome, and commend to all who wish to read wisely and profitably, this manual of Prof. Porter — not that he is always

right, but so near it that there is little room for exceptions. We do not quite agree with his position in regard to Gibbon's Rome. We do not regret that it was written in the spirit and with the aim he censures. Rather we are glad that the great historian has shown us the *best* that can be done against the divine origin and growth of Christianity from that point. And what has his famous Fifteenth Chapter accomplished in this respect? Nothing. If, then, Gibbon fails so utterly in his labored effort, the attack from that side may as well be abandoned; for, if *he* fails, who will be likely to succeed?

8. Cornell's Physical Geography: Accompanied with Nineteen Pages of Maps, a great Variety of Map Questions, and One Hundred and Thirty Diagrams and Pictorial Illustrations; and embracing a Detailed Description of the Physical Features of the United States. D. Appleton & Co. For sale by Noyes, Holmes & Co.

The educational publications of this firm are marked by two important characteristics — the thoroughness and good judgment of their editorial preparation; and the faithfulness and liberal spirit with which the publishers do their part. This volume is an example. The editorial supervision has furnished a book which is pleasant reading for all, young and old, every page of which is laden with most useful and interesting knowledge; while the singularly beautiful and attractive maps and illustrations, the numerous figures and diagrams, afford a picture of the earth, its productions, animals, inhabitants and physical phenomena, which make it half a library in itself. What an amount of valuable information, for example, is condensed into the compact and luminous paragraphs of the first and tenth chapters, so sparing of words, yet so clear in statement. And what a contrast between this generous and charming volume, and the poor, cheap, starved-looking school-books of fifty years ago.

9. Nature and Art in the Old World; or, Sketches of Travel in Europe and the Orient. By John S. Lee, Professor in St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y. Cincinnati: Williamson & Cantwell.

This nicely-printed, fair-looking volume — a new witness to the enterprise and taste of our Western publishers — is good proof that Prof. Lee is one of those who have the faculty of seeing much in a short time. The book covers most of the countries of Europe, as well as Syria, Palestine and Egypt; and the author seems to have seen most of the things notable and worth seeing in all these regions. His descriptions have enabled us to recall in many cases a vivid picture of scenes and places formerly visited, and to renew the pleasures of long ago. He writes from personal observation and actual experience, and not from guide-books and what others have described. His often mention of railroads, where fifteen years ago the traveller found only diligence or vettura, shows the improvements brought about in that time, and explains how the author was able to accomplish so much in so few months. We thank the Professor for the pleasure his book has given us, and we are glad to learn that it has been so cordially welcomed both by the travelled and untravelled among his friends.

10. Ad Clerum: Advices to a Young Preacher. By Joseph Parker, D. D., author of "Ecce Deus." Roberts Brothers.

An odd mixture of excellent "advices" and small talk; of wise counsels ripened by experience and observation, and smart sayings the offspring of self-conceit. And yet we heartily commend the book to ministers and laymen as one in which they will find both profit and amusement. Laymen will discover many of their own criticisms of the minister's pulpit efforts expressed in an off-hand, dashing way; and ministers — not young ministers necessarily — will find glaring faults in composition and delivery, in reading of Scripture and hymns, in prayer, pulpit manners, and the discharge of pastoral duties, set forth in a way to compel attention, if not correction. And this is done by no dry and tedious exhortation, but in a free and easy style of talk which, while it paints the sin in strong colors, must often provoke a laugh from the offender at his own expense.

"The Minister in the Pulpit" is one of the best, most practical and, we are sorry to say it, one of the most-needed chapters in the book. In spite of over-statement, the section on "Unsuccessful Men" will be useful to those preachers who fondly imagine that the cause of their failure is the fact that they are a century in advance of the world. No minister, young or old, can read the book without getting from it something suggestive, corrective or preventive.

11. Across America and Asia. Notes of a Five Years' Journey around the World, and of a Residence in Arizona, Japan and China. By Raphael Pumpelly, Professor in Harvard University, and sometime Mining Engineer in the service of the Chinese and Japanese Governments. Fifth Edition Revised. New York: Leypoldt & Holt.

Having read this book, we can well understand why it should go to the third edition in three months, and now, so soon after, to the fifth. As a book of travels it has unusual attractions and merits. The freshness and value of its information touching peoples about whom so little is really known, its important facts respecting the climate, physical geography and geology of the regions visited, the coal districts of China, the gold mines of Siberia, the religions of Japan, Japanese Art, Border Life and the American Desert, the increasingly important question of Chinese Emigration and Colonization, the origin and religious bearing of the Chinese Rebellion, the interesting statements respecting Buddhism — all these subjects are invested with a new and surprising interest. No matter how many times the reader may have been over the ground, he will find the information furnished as fresh and original as if he were reading the story for the first time. And the narrative is made as entertaining and informing as any account of travel and personal adventure ever put on record — the illustrations, maps and tabular matter adding greatly to the interest and intelligibility of the narrative. We put it on the same shelf with Livingstone, Baker, Speke, Hall, Vambery, etc.; equal in all, superior in many, particulars to any of them.

It is impossible to point out any one chapter or portion of the book as more instructive or attractive than the rest. The volume is

remarkable for the equal interest attaching to every part; and the finish and repose of the author's style is not among the least of its charms. There is not a tiresome chapter, nor a dry page of reading, from the opening to the close. Whether imparting valuable historical and scientific information, or rehearsing his wild rides in Siberian wildernesses and among the borderers of our own land, or his adventurous journey along the "Great Wall," or describing the religions of China and Japan, and the superstitions of the Russian, he holds the reader's attention with equal power. We have marked many paragraphs relating to some of these subjects, which we shall give our readers from time to time under the "Religious World," or "General Review." The following, respecting Buddhism, must suffice for the present. The reader will notice the striking parallelism in the first paragraph with the Decalogue, and in the second with the Catholic Church:

"This blessedness (Nirvana) was open to those who became Buddhas by observing the ten commandments, viz: 1. Thou shalt not kill; 2. Thou shalt not steal; 3. Thou shalt not be unchaste; 4. Thou shalt not lie; 5. Thou shalt not bear false witness; 6. Thou shalt not swear; 7. Thou shalt not speak evil; 8. Thou shalt not covet; 9. Thou shalt not take vengeance; 10. Thou shalt not be superstitious, *i. e.* believing in gods. But this was too unsatisfactory; and to satisfy the moral necessity of the Indian mind for a belief in future punishments and rewards, the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, and ultimately of a paradise and a hell, were taken from Brahminism, with many other corruptions; and as the new faith spread beyond the confines of India, a whole hierarchy of saints, with a queen of heaven at their head as in Catholicism, was built upon the spirit-worship of the converted peoples. (B. C. 146.)

"At an early date the organization of Buddhism and its discipline received the main features which have lasted to this day. The divisions into active clergy and monks, all celibates as well as nuns, the ranks of the clergy, the ritual, veneration of relics, intercession of saints, confession though not auricular, organization of monastic and conventual life, use of the rosary in prayer, shaving the heads of clergy and nuns, synods and church councils, the clerical costumes especially in Thibet, the sermons in Japan, ringing of bells for matins and vespers — all bear the strongest analogies to their counterparts in Catholicism. The temple service, with sprinkling of holy water, burning of incense in censers, and with chants, resembles high mass. One is forced to the conclusion that western ritualism, and much of the superstition on which it is based, is of Pagan birth." pp. 164–166.

12. Hand-Book of Bible Geography; containing the Name, Pronunciation and Meaning of every Place, Nation and Tribe mentioned in both the Canonical and Apocryphal Scriptures. With Descriptive and Historical Notes. By Rev. George Whitney. Illustrated by nearly One Hundred Engravings, and Forty Maps and Plans. New York: Carlton & Lanahan.

This book is more even than its ample title promises. We have been pleasantly surprised in turning over its pages to discover how new and fresh its information is on many important questions. The author has often written into his pages the *very latest* results of exploration and criticism, and he gives us not only "meanings" of the names of places, but sometimes a clear and condensed history of the place itself. An eminent example of this is found under the head of *Jerusalem*, filling thirty-three closely-printed pages, in which the reader will find not only an admirable historical sketch of the Holy City, but also the most substantial and notable results of the recent excavations and discoveries by Capts. Warren and Wilson,

without the lengthy and sometimes tedious details of measurements, compass directions, etc., to be found in "Jerusalem Recovered." "Nineveh," "Sinai," "Palestine," "Sea," "Jordan," etc., are also examples of this thoroughness of treatment for a work of this character. Of course in all these titles more is given than the reader has a right to expect; and therefore in others, as "Egypt," "Ethiopia," etc., the brevity of treatment disappoints him.

But among its most valuable features are its Maps, Plans and Illustrations, which we have seldom seen surpassed in a work for popular use. The Maps and Plans are prepared with great care, based on the most recent surveys, admirably drawn and colored, and are most useful helps to the understanding of the geography and topography of the sacred localities. There are seventeen full-paged maps, several of which are fine specimens of art, and nearly forty full-paged engravings — not pictures merely, but all that is meant by *illustrations*. The maps and plans accompanying the article on "Jerusalem," are specially deserving notice alike for their beauty, and their help to a proper understanding of the descriptions in the text.

We heartily welcome such volumes as these. Students of the Scriptures and Sunday School Teachers will find it convenient as a reference book; and Parents will find its information pleasing and instructive to themselves and their children in the study of that Book which, the better it is understood, the more wonderful it seems.

13. Wesley his own Historian. Illustrations of his Character, Labors and Achievements. From his own Diaries. By Rev. Edwin L. Janes. New York: Carlton & Lanahan.

This charming volume is made up of selections from Wesley's Journal, running from Oct. 1735, to Oct. 1790, a period of fifty-five years. It is delightful, profitable and very suggestive reading, and every preacher in the land should possess it. The extracts are brief, but full of fruitful matter, and exactly the thing to be read at leisure moments, or when weary with close study, or when travelling, or when stopping at railroad stations, or by the way-side. Beautiful are the lessons to be learned from the faith, charity, humility, devotion, the labors and sufferings, the studies and prayers, the successes and surprising results of the preaching of this marvellous man. Here are the germs of scores of instructive and saving sermons, and the incentives to earnest missionary work. We doubt if any one can read the book without a kindling within him of devotion and generous impulse.

14. The History of Greece. By Prof. Dr. Ernst Curtius. Translated by Adolphus William Ward, Professor of History in Manchester College. Charles Scribner & Co.

The history of Greece has special attraction and instruction for the American reader, more than that of any country of the ancient world. The form of government, the political leagues, the rivalries

and jealousies of the several states, the doctrine of state rights, the ambitions of leaders, the diffusion of knowledge among the people, the noble heroes and patriots whose deeds adorn her annals, her gradual political and moral decadence and final overthrew by Macedonian and Roman, are freighted with useful lessons, warnings and counsels, for the people of this country. This work of Dr. Curtius is considered a masterpiece of historical literature. Without the tedious details and tiresome disquisitions of Grote, he groups together all the important events, and gives the reader a carefully-drawn picture of the times, and shows the secret of her wonderful influence on her own and all subsequent ages. We shall return to this work in future numbers.

15. Roman Imperialism, and Other Lectures and Essays. By J. R. Seeley, M. A., Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, Eng., author of "Ecce Homo." Roberts Brothers.

These essays are marked by the same originality of thought and clearness of statement so conspicuous in "Ecce Homo," and like that also with occasional guesses and theories to which some of his readers will take exception. We think the decline of Roman power was due more to moral than physical causes — to the absence of that high sense of honor which belonged to the early republic; to the lust of conquest and the consequent growth of wealth, luxury and effeminacy; to the spread of vice, sensualism and general corruption, ending in the gradual breaking up of the foundations on which rest all domestic, social and national life; thus opening the way for the successful invasion and conquest of the northern barbarians. The great want of Rome in her last days was not soldiers, but *men;* not peasantry, but noble*men*. We have not space to speak of the other Lectures, and so give as a substitute the following from "The Church as a Teacher of Morality":

"In all the professions, a man's first duty now is to renounce the ambition of becoming distinguished for activity; the temptation chiefly to be avoided is that of undertaking more work than can be done in first-rate style. The quality of work must be improved, and for that end, if necessary, the quantity reduced. A higher and calmer sort of activity must be arrived at, — economy in energy, expenditure without waste, heat without haste. The moral teachers of the community should set the example of an industry thus tempered, of a proper distribution of life between contemplation and action. They are the last persons in the world who should allow their work to be spoiled by the unreasonable expectations of others. The question for all people, but particularly for them, is not how they are expected to do their work, but how their work may best be done; and the higher the kind of work, the more necessary it is that the worker should claim and use the privilege of doing it in his own way."

16. Chips from a German Workshop. By Max Müller, Foreign Member of the French Institute. Vol. III. Essays on Literature, Biography and Antiquities. Charles Scribner & Co.

It is now only necessary to say that a book is by Max Mülelr to secure it a careful reading from all persons of scholarly habits, and fond of philological inquiry. This volume, though replete with pleasing and often curious information, has not the interest or value of

the two preceding volumes. It is more miscellaneous in its contents; but in "Cornish Antiquities," "Are there Jews in Cornwall?" "Joinville," etc., he falls into his old ways again, and is as pleasing and instructive as ever. "Bunsen" and his "Letters" are full of interest to all lovers of learning and learned men.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Recovery of Jerusalem. A Narrative of Exploration and Discovery in the City and the Holy Land. By Capt. Wilson, R. E., Capt. Warren, R. E., etc., etc. With an Introduction by Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D. D., Dean of Westminster. Edited by Walter Morrison, M. P. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

The Descent of Man, and Selection in relation to Sex. By Charles Darwin. With Illustrations. Vol. I. D. Appleton & Co. [Two important issues from the fruitful press of these eminent publishers; entitled to more space than is given to ordinary book notices. The last, therefore, will be examined in our next number by one of our contributors whose scientific attainments amply qualify him for the work; and the first is reserved for review by one who recently visited Jerusalem, while the excavations were in progress, and other localities mentioned in the volume, and will therefore write from observations and impressions still fresh in mind.]

Veza; or, The Russian Princess and the English Earl. D. Appleton & Co.

Phantastes. A Faerie Romance for Men and Women. By George Mac Donald, author of "Robert Falconer." Loring, Publisher.

Birth and Education. By Marie Sophie Schwartz. Translated from the Swedish by Selma Borg and Marie A. Brown. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham.

Fifteen Years. A Picture of the Last Century. By Talvi (Mrs. Therese Robinson). D. Appleton & Co.

The Young Pioneers of the North-West. By Dr. C. H. Pearson, author of the "Cabin on the Prairie," etc. Illustrated. Lee & Shepard.

Scribner's Library of Wonders. Wonderful Escapes. Revised from the French of F. Bernard, and Original Chapters added by Richard Whiting. With Twenty-six Illustrations. [We confess to a liking for such narratives as these, as exhibitions of what men will dare for the sake of liberty, and of the wonderful resources and courage which misfortune will sometimes discover in those before wholly unconscious of them.]

The Heir of Redclyffe. By the author of the "Two Guardians." 2 vols. Heartsease; or, The Brother's Wife. By the author of "The Heir of Redclyffe." D Appleton & Co.

Life and Nature under the Tropics; or, Sketches of Travels among the Andes, and on the Orinoco and Amazon. By H. M. and P. V. N. Myers. D. Appleton & Co. [The sixth expedition of the sort sent out by Williams College, of which fact it may be justly proud; as well as of the young men who can make so readable a book as this. It is an honorable testimony to their fitness for travel, and their careful observation of natural phenomena.]

The Earthly Paradise. A Poem. By William Morris. Part IV. Roberts Brothers. [We have already borne cordial testimony to the merits of this extraordinary work. Mr. Morris is to us a perfect wonder. Here is the conclusion of more than twenty stories in rhyme, comprising some *twelve thousand lines*, all written in a little more than three years, in the intervals of business! And they are not merely rhymes —they glow all through with poetic fervor and beauty; they are fragrant with the breath of nature, and often reach down into the deepest depths of the human heart. Undoubtedly some of the descriptions are too much encumbered with details, and the narratives are occasionally tediously lengthy; but, in spite of these drawbacks, "The Earthly Paradise" is a marvel of poetic wealth and creative power.]

Westward by Rail: The New Route to the East. By W. F. Rae. D. Appleton & Co. [The best book of travel in the United States ever written by an Englishman —candid, appreciative and just, both in its censure and its praise. California, Salt Lake City and the Mormons, Chicago and the West, Boston and Harvard University, Railroads and Hotels, Americans and Foreigners, all meet with equally honorable and discriminating treatment.]

The Mystery of Suffering, and Other Discourses. By E. De Pressense, D. D. Carlton & Lanahan. [It would be strange if so eminent a man should not say some things, in the course of a hundred pages, deserving profound consideration, on a theme so rich as the "Mystery of Suffering"; but these notable things are so mixed with the errors of his creed as to render them almost powerless for good. We can hardly see how one who perceives so clearly the philosophy of the Book of Job, who can reason as wisely as he does on page 40 and others, can possibly run by the logical conclusions of such facts and reasonings without seeing them, and talk as on page 100 *et seq.* — and finally close the argument by saying that if we loved as God loves, "we should fill up the sufferings of *the Saviour who suffers for every lost soul until it has found life!*"]

Sermons by R. Winter Hamilton, D. D., LL. D., author of the "Doctrine of Rewards and Punishments," etc. Carlton & Lanahan.

Beside the above, and those already noticed, we have received from *Carlton & Lanahan* the following, to several of which we shall give attention in our next issue: "Arts of Intoxication, the Aim, and the Results"; "Stories and Pictures from Church History"; "Witch Hill: A History of Salem Witchcraft"; "Memoir of Washington Irving"; "Life and Character of Thomas Chalmers"; "Rome and Italy at the Opening of the Œcumenical Council"; M'Clintock's "Living Words." These publishers are taking high rank for the good taste and beauty displayed in their publications.

The Revelation of John; with Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Practical. By Rev. Henry Cowles, D. D. D. Appleton & Co. [We shall call attention to some noteworthy points in this volume in our July number.]

The Illustrated Catholic Family Almanac for the United States, for the year of our Lord 1871. New York: Catholic Publication Society. [The Catholic Church has in this country 160 educational institutions of the higher class, with 1,746 professors, 2,760 priests and sisters, 30,000 pupils, and 270,000 volumes in their libraries. While all the Protestant sects of Europe and America have only 132 missionaries in China, the Catholic Church has 510; and 800 more in Japan, Tonquin and Cochin China, where the Protestants have none, with the exception of two in Japan.]

The Silent Partner. By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, author of "Gates Ajar," "Hedged In," etc. James R. Osgood & Co.

Ad Fidem; or, Parish Evidences of the Bible. By Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., author of "Ecce Cœlum," etc. Boston: Noyes, Holmes & Co.

Gutenburg and the Art of Printing. By Emily C. Pearson, author of "Ruth's Sacrifice," etc. Noyes, Holmes & Co.

Annual of Scientific Discovery; or, Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art for 1871, exhibiting the most important Discoveries and Improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Biology, Botany, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Geographies, Antiquities, etc., together with Notes on the Progress of Science during the year 1870; a List of Recent Scientific Publications; Obituaries of Eminent Scientific Men, etc. Edited by John Trowbridge, S. B., aided by W. R. Nichols and C. R. Cross. Gould & Lincoln.

These last four volumes come too late for this number. We shall give them all a hearing in our July issue.

ARTICLE XII.

Biographical Sketches.

II. EDWARD TURNER — Concluded.

The "Declaration" and "Appeal" first appeared in the *Christian Repository*, in December, 1822, and were republished in the Boston *Universalist Magazine*, Jan. 25, 1823. The immediate effect to Mr. Turner can be in no way so well told as by himself. He recited the account in a series of letters (which he never dreamed would be given to the public) to his eldest daughter (Mrs. Weld), immediately after his removal to Portsmouth. It is as follows:

"Agreeably to an intimation that I made some time since, of an intention to give you a brief recital of the train of events which has led to my dismission, I now commence the unpleasant task. You will not expect a minutely circumstantial detail of all that has occurred in relation to this affair, as to do that would form a volume. I shall endeavor to give you all the important facts, in such order as they took place, and shall notice in passing the agency that some men have had in this business from whom you would not have expected such a course of conduct. . . . I shall, first of all, be as particular as possible in stating the original grounds of the difficulty between my people and me.—You have known that I have long believed in a future retribution, and that I have not understood the Scriptures to support the doctrine of the immediate happiness of all men at death. Yet I had never *pointedly* preached my views, but had always predicated salvation upon the repentance and reformation of the subject, alleging only that 'God would have all men to be saved' in the final issue, or 'in the dispensation of the fulness of times.' Mr. Ballou and his correspondents in the *Magazine* were earnestly engaged in defending the idea of immediate salvation. Controversy began. It was pursued till it became tiresome to many, and presented our order in rather an unpleasant light. About that time, in May, 1822, I delivered a discourse to my people from 1 Cor. ix. 26, in which I labored to show that the Christian race had its crown, or reward, at its end; that this is the final approbation of our

Judge, and that every Christian will act with reference to the attainment of so glorious an object. . . . This discourse certainly involved the idea of rewards and punishments beyond this life. It gave no offence, of which I ever heard, except in one instance. Mr. —— attacked *me* violently, and labored to excite disaffection in the parish, but without success. Things then went on as usual. In the summer of 1822, we who believed in future punishment made proposals to the editors of the *Universalist Magazine* to publish their sentiments by way of statement, offering their reasons in support of them; we would do the same, and leave the public to judge of the correctness of either, and avoid all controversy for the future. This proposition was rejected. We then held a meeting at Shirley, in September, 1822, and agreed to publish a 'Declaration' of our views. This was published in . . . the *Christian Repository*, edited by Samuel C. Loveland, of Vermont. The 'Declaration' was accompanied by 'An Appeal to the Public.' We offered our reasons for disbelieving in immediate salvation, and expressed our views of the tendency of that doctrine. The editors of the *Magazine* complained bitterly, and charged us with breaking fellowship with them. This we denied. I offered to submit the whole affair to Committees chosen from our respective parishes, and abide their decision. They refused, and immediately published 'a Reply' to our 'Appeal and Declaration.' . . . By this time, the ——s, —— and ——, were successful in producing a ferment in the society. The male members of the church came together, and I met with them, and went into an explanation of the 'Declaration,' and endeavored to show them [evidently, the ——s, above referred to] that they misunderstood and misconstrued that writing. This, however, had no effect with them. They were evidently pleased to have found a pretext for raising a noise against me. They asserted that 'nothing short of a retraction of the "Declaration," in as public a manner as it was made, would satisfy them.' No others of the church, however, joined with them in this high requisition. If I had publicly retracted, I should have ruined myself at once, and the persons who required it would have been the first to have expressed their contempt of their measure. Besides, I had done nothing which I was conscious ought to be retracted, and therefore treated their requirement as it deserved. . . . The ——s left the meeting and the communion, and made themselves very busy in keeping up the excitement.

You have learned what constituted the great offence which has been the cause, or occasion, of such woful consequences. . . . The authors of the 'Appeal and Declaration' were charged with the design of dissolving the Convention, and accordingly, they were considered and treated by the editors of the *Magazine* and the malcontents of my society as a band of schismatics. We bore this without replying.[49] I was determined, for one, to see to what length the domineering spirit of my opposers would go, while I meant to neglect nothing which could tend to produce peace upon honorable terms, and besides, to lose no time in defending myself when the subject of the offence was called up. On the 18th of February, 1823, by the assistance of some good brethren, we succeeded in making an amicable settlement with two of the editors, Mr. Ballou, 2d, and Mr. Whittemore, Mr. Ballou, senior, being absent. This settlement was satisfactory at the time; but no sooner did Mr. Ballou return home, than he influenced those young men to fall from the agreement they had made and signed, and thus the whole was rendered abortive.[50] Not only so, but the senior Mr. Ballou's society voted

[49] Dr. Whittemore (*Life*, etc., Vol. ii. p. 222) says, "No rejoinder to the reply of the editors was attempted, and it seems to have had the force of demonstration among the people"; thus evidently conveying the impression that Mr. Turner and his friends felt themselves so overwhelmed and extinguished that they had not the courage to attempt a reply. The fact was, however, as will appear in the further progress of the above narrative, that they were silent in the interest of peace, hoping that, by private negotiation and adjustment, the difficulty might be kept from becoming a further dispute in the papers. Several papers in my hands indicate this,—among the rest, a letter from Mr. Turner to Rev. H. Ballou, 2d, of March 7th, 1823, in which he says:

"When you were last at my house, I conceived that there was more than a *probability* that our difficulties might be speedily settled . . . on the ground upon which we proceeded before [see "agreement" in following Note, which had been repudiated before this letter was written], to which you seemed to accede. I am now convinced that your brethren are not, at present, disposed to this measure; nor do I learn that they are willing to refer the matter to a Council. I am willing to do the latter, if we cannot agree to the former. But I am not willing that the business should lie in its present state. You must know that our long silence in respect to your reply is no assurance that we will be silent forever. We know that, if you will neither come to an adjustment on the principles which governed us before, nor agree to choose a *mutual* Council, we are entitled to call a Council, *ex-parte*, and shall avail ourselves of the privilege. I am still willing to do as you and I agreed the other day; . . . but I am not satisfied to wait much longer without coming to some decision."

[50] Among the papers in my possession, I find one which evidently gives the terms of this "amicable settlement." It is endorsed, "First Settlement with Editors." It is in Mr. Turner's handwriting, and is a paper of no small importance in this connection, as showing the conciliatory spirit in which he was willing to act. It is as follows:

"The authors of the 'Appeal and Declaration,' which were published in the *Christian Repository* of December, 1822, disavow any intention to injure the moral character of the editors of the *Universalist Magazine*, [or] to wound their feelings, or those of any brethren who differ from the authors of these papers with respect to the doctrine of future punishment. They also disavow any intention to break the fellowship of the

that their minister should not exchange with one of the authors of the 'Appeal,' etc., nor with any who would exchange with us. Mr. Whittemore's society passed a similar vote. Here, then, we had a Universalist inquisition which would have done honor to John Calvin when he burned Servetus. About this time, I preached and published a discourse on Acts xxii. 1. This was well received, and satisfied the minds of many. . . . The next event of consequence was the annual meeting of our society, in the latter part of March. . . . The owners of pews had hitherto exercised, exclusively, the privilege of voting, and though there were many who paid taxes on pews, yet as they owned none, they had never acted in meeting. But at this meeting, —— moved that non-proprietors should be allowed to vote on the question of my serving the society another year. This motion was seconded by ——, with this addition, that our male singers also should exercise the privilege of voting. The motion was unanimously carried, and the whole society acted upon the question. The design . . . was unquestionably to obtain a greater number against me; but it came out otherwise. The votes were ninety-seven in my favor, twenty-seven against me. —— then moved that no record should be made of the proceeding, that nothing might appear to show that any difficulty had ever existed among us. This was considered conciliatory. Yet —— and his brother would not attend the meetings, nor communions, but went to Mr. Walker's meeting, where they continued till my dismissal. We then went on as usual. Our house was well filled, and the pews which those persons had occupied were soon improved by others. We had reason, indeed, to believe that we might remain in peace for one year; but the spirit of opposition could not rest. The salamander must dwell in fire. The persons who were

Convention, or to stigmatize the characters of any of its members; and they deeply regret that such should, in any instance, have been thought to have been the meaning of their language; and so far as this impression has been made, the language which conveys, or is thought to convey, such a meaning is hereby recalled.

And the editors of the *Universalist Magazine*, on their part, in consideration of the above statements, wish it to be understood that the allegations and remarks contained in their reply of February 1, published in the *Magazine*, so far as they regarded the characters of the authors of the 'Appeal and Declaration,' are hereby withdrawn, and that thus the union and harmony, which have been for a moment interrupted, are again restored and confirmed."

Is it difficult to see who, or what, was in the way of "peace" when *such* an "agreement" was repudiated? Observe here that this "agreement" was signed, with Mr. Whittemore, by Mr. Ballou, 2d, who (see *Life*, etc., Vol. ii. p. 222, *note)* wrote the reply, the imputations of which against the character of Mr. T. and his associates are thus "withdrawn." Other papers, showing the same spirit on the part of Mr. Turner, might be given were there room.

most inimical to me were not well received at the new meeting to which they had gone. Their conduct towards me had excited a detestation in the breasts of all considerate people; and some did not hesitate to tell the ——s that they did not want them at their meeting. I presume that this ill reception operated powerfully to cause them to renew the contest with me; and I am fully persuaded that if they had been satisfied to have remained, I should have received no further trouble or interruption. — While these events were occurring, I made a new proposal to the editors of the *Magazine*, with a view to an adjustment of our difficulties. I offered to submit to the decision of a Council, mutually chosen by them and us. But the proposal was rejected. You will be able to make your own comments upon this. — You will wish to know, undoubtedly, how your father, unused as he was to trials of this kind, felt and acted while passing this scene of trial. I can only say that I was wonderfully supported. I lost neither food nor sleep; was able to attend steadily upon the duties of my profession, and could mingle in all common pleasures of social life. Yet it was a *trial*. But I had numerous friends who stood by me, and gave me their countenance and encouragement. The whole town seemed to take a feeling interest in my situation, and considered me as oppressed and ill-used. I was, indeed, 'persecuted, but not forsaken.'

In the mean time, I was active in laboring to effect a settlement with the editors of the *Magazine*. A paper was forwarded me from them, which, if I would sign it, would settle all difficulties. This I refused to do for two reasons: The paper amounted to a total recantation of what I had done in the 'Appeal and Declaration,' and was in fact a renunciation of my belief. Another reason was, the editors offered me no concessions for their scandalous abuse in their reply to the 'Appeal,' etc. When I had rejected this proposal, I offered to sign a paper acknowledging my fellowship with those who denied a future punishment, and declaring that I had never meant to exclude them from my fellowship by any expressions in the 'Appeal,' and asserting that the language we had used had been misconstrued. This proposal was rejected. Mr. Ballou continued to declare that nothing short of a total retraction of our writings would satisfy him. — Things continued much in this way till June, when, as I was slowly recovering from a severe attack of the pleurisy, and was yet weak in body and in a degree imbecile in mind, the opposition made another movement. They called a meeting, and

took a vote upon the question whether I should continue to be the minister of the society. At this meeting, the very persons who had before voted [moved?] to allow the non-proprietors and singers the privilege of acting upon the question, voted to exclude them, and, of course, they were all turned adrift. The vote was decided by the pew-holders [proprietors] only. Still there was a respectable majority for my continuance. The opposers were, therefore, foiled once more. — In July, I decided to journey to New York. . . . I returned in August.

. . . The affairs of the society continued much as they had been till about the middle of September, when that restless spirit which can never be pleased except when in mischief, went again to work. Some individuals of the opposition advised me to ask a dismission. I saw through this vile piece of advice, and acted accordingly. Doubtful of obtaining a majority to dismiss me, and knowing that no good reason could be offered for the measure, and knowing, also, that if I did request to be dismissed, my own friends would feel it a duty to vote my dismissal, they wished to throw as much as possible of the business on our hands. But I was not to be cajoled by them. I replied, 'I will never ask a dismission. Go on and dismiss me as soon as you please. Take care, however, to assign suitable reasons for the act. Bring your charges before the meeting, and let my answers be heard. But be cautious you do not vote me away without establishing justifiable causes.' . . . The next step in this nefarious transaction was, a paper was drawn up, setting forth that, as a difficulty existed between the people and the minister, it was deemed advisable to dissolve the connection by dismissing him. This was handed about, and several of my *real friends* subscribed it, having been made to believe that the society would be injured if I staid, and that the property in the house would soon be less valuable, or worth nothing. Some who subscribed . . . recanted, and voted for my continuance. Others did not attend the meeting. My best friends said, 'If we go and vote, and obtain a majority, it will not end the quarrel. Let them do what they please, and we will take care of you afterwards in our own way.' Accordingly, several did not attend. — When the meeting came, I sent in a written communication, desiring the society to exhibit their charges against me, if they had any, and to let them be acted upon in a regular way. Will you believe that it was with difficulty my communication could obtain a reading? — that

objections were made to reading it? Yet so it really was. However, it *was* read. Still, no charges were exhibited, — no reasons acted upon. The vote was taken. I was dismissed. A Committee was then chosen to draw up the reasons of my being dismissed, which was done some time after. This was like the Indian's court and decision: 'Hang the man first, and then try him.' . . . The truth was, no charges could be alleged, no reasons offered for my dismission, which my enemies dared to bring forward in a regular way, and have them submitted to the decision of the society after due deliberation. They therefore chose another course. . . . I was dismissed, and the intelligence . . . was rather a relief to my feelings than otherwise. I had fought the battle through. I would not desert my friends, to humor the caprice nor gratify the will of my enemies. I felt no fear of want of employment, and was unconscious of any blame.

My dismission took place on the last day of September, by a small majority; and even that could not have been obtained if all the society had acted. . . . It was voted, in great condescension, that I might have the use of the house the next Sabbath, if I wished, as it might be supposed that my friends would expect a farewell discourse. I prepared accordingly, . . . and preached on 1 Pet. v. 10, to a crowded audience. . . . The opposition attended, and received such notice as I thought they deserved. It was such, however, as made them hang their heads in evident shame and confusion. . . . The day on which I was dismissed had not closed before a subscription was opened, to retain me to preach in the town; and in a week it was subscribed by more than 100 males and as many females, all of whom contributed liberally to my support. The Monday evening after the Sabbath on which I preached for the last time in the meeting-house, my friends held a meeting, chose their officers, and appointed a Committee to wait on the Selectmen to obtain leave to occupy the Town-Hall. They received permission. The Committee then waited on me with the request that I would preach to my friends. I gave my affirmative answer, and they reported their doings to their brethren the same evening. Accordingly, the next Sabbath, we assembled in the Town-Hall. . . . We had about 700; and during the 6 months that I preached there, we experienced no diminution, but rather had an increase of numbers. — I have been particular in noticing the preceding circumstances, as they carry powerful evidence that I was dismissed by a fac-

tion; that I was never deserted, and at the last, could have had as many hearers as ever, who followed me from principle and from a sense of the unmerited persecution with which I had been assailed. The public feeling was all in my favor. The several religious societies in Charlestown took a deep interest in my situation, and expressed their satisfaction that I was likely to continue my ministry in the place.

In December last [1823], the Southern Association met at Milford. The authors of the 'Appeal and Declaration' had been impeached at the preceding session in June. They had been adjudged without a hearing, and the final decision of their case was now to be taken. . . . Three of us only attended. We submitted various proposals for an accomodation of our difficulties, none of which was accepted by Mr. Ballou and his associates, because we refused to make a total retraction of what we had written, and it was stated that nothing short of that would satisfy the original complainants. When the subject had been long agitated without the prospect of coming to a decision, I moved that, as we had made so many proposals which the editors had rejected, the Association should next offer terms of its own, and tell us what would satisfy them, and we would soon say whether we would comply with their terms. This motion obtained. A Committee was appointed. They drew up terms which were accepted by the Association. These terms were nothing more than that we acknowleged our fellowship with those who differed from us on the article of future punishment. As this was what we had always asserted, and often told the editors, we were willing to sign the proposals, which we accordingly did. Thus this mighty affair terminated. I returned home, and shortly after intimated to Mr. Ballou that I should be glad to exchange with him. He refused, however; . . . his reason . . . was this: 'He would not preach at the Town Hall!' The truth was, the ——s told him if he exchanged with me, they would have no more to do with him. . . . This fact came out by a voluntary statement of H. Ballou, 2d. . . . This state of affairs continued till I was invited to preach in Portsmouth, in March last. . . . I visited Portsmouth, and received a call from the society early in April. My friends in Charlestown saw that they must do something. They did not attend the annual meeting of the society in March, because very unfair means were employed to prevent my going back to the meeting-house. My opposers, perceiving that a majority was likely to be ob-

tained in my favor, disposed of parts of pews to increase the number against me. When this . . . was discovered, my friends refused to attend the meeting, and opened a subscription to retain me in Charlestown. This subscription amounted, in two or three days, to about 800 dollars. Several gentlemen subscribed who were members of other societies. But as it was uncertain whether we could continue to meet in the Town-Hall, and as some thought it best to reunite with the people at the meeting-house, . . . I closed with the invitation of the society in Portsmouth. . . . I knew that in doing this I should leave a place of trouble and war for one of tranquility and peace. I had stood by my friends through a long and arduous conflict. I had never deserted them till the index of Providence pointed to a place where I could labor in peace, where I was unanimously acceptable, and where my real friends thought I had better go than to stay in Charlestown and be exposed to the assaults of 'unreasonable and wicked men.'

I shall do nothing in this but review briefly the principal circumstances and events. . . . 1. The difficulty commenced in a publication, called the 'Appeal and Declaration.' . . . This publication was intended for nothing more than a plain exposition of our views of the doctrine of immediate salvation; nor was it anything more in reality. We had a perfect right to express our opinion of a doctrine and its moral tendency. We did this, but impeached no man's character, nor called in question any man's sincerity. We were, however, stigmatized in . . reply. . . . When the ——s found that the editors had waged war with me, they felt strong, and directly commenced the course of measures which I have detailed. They were unremitting in effort, and having some influence, they succeeded. . . . 2. But if the 'Appeal and Declaration' were as bad as the editors and ——s would represent, I offered — first, to submit to a decision of a Committee of the several societies; which being rejected, I offered to abide the judgment of a council of ministers; which was also rejected. What more could I do? Was I to crouch before Ballou, and have my accuser for my judge? My spirit was not so tame and submissive as that. I told them I would not do it, if they impaled me. 3. . . . I presented a communication to the society, stating what offers I had made towards a reconciliation. My object in this was to have the society decide whether I had not done all in my power towards an adjustment. Because, if I had, they could

proceed no further. Of this my enemies were sensible, and accordingly, though a Committee was appointed to report upon my communication, yet they never did, and I was finally dismissed unheard. 4. You will judge from comparing the conduct of the editors with that of the promoters of opposition in the society, if they were not in close league, having the same object and the same determination. . . . — I have omitted a thousand things which, to relate, would prove painful and irritating. I am willing to forget them. That I suffered much . . . you will easily believe. I have gone to the house of God with an aching heart, and sometimes with almost a distracted mind. Yet I was able to perform service with usual freedom and a common acceptance. My friends all wondered that I could do so well in such circumstances. I was a wonder to myself. This train of events has given me new proofs of the all-directing, superintending providence of God. It has shown me the power of friendship to soothe anxiety, and disarm trouble of half its energy. I have experienced the most sincere and ardent attachment from numerous individuals of my own faith, and have seen with pleasure that religion does not confine her influence to sects. I have received the countenance and support of the other different societies in Charlestown, with whom it was the decided opinion that I was . . . wantonly persecuted. I will only add that I grudge no man who has been concerned in this business the honor of his conduct here, nor the reward it will meet hereafter."

Some of these details might have been omitted; but it was judged best to give the narrative substantially as Mr. Turner wrote it. The contest he described was evidently a severe one: on the surface, so decidedly personal, that, did it not materially help to explain Mr. Turner's separation from us, and especially did it not mark and illustrate, as nothing else so well does, one of the "noticeable changes of doctrine, and consequently of religious character," through which, as Dr. Ballou says, "our denomination has gone,"[51] it would be, if not clearly improper, certainly inexpedient to record it

[51] *Universalist Quarterly*, vol. v., p. 80. How much reason we have to regret that Dr. Ballou did not have leisure to finish the account of these changes which he so admirably began! No other man will ever be able to describe the third change of which he speaks, so well as he could have done it.

here. But through the contest of which this was part, our life as a church was in process of development; and amidst the various elements of this conflict, moral and intellectual, our theology was passing through one of the stages — under the circumstances, inevitable — in its transition from old severities and temporary conceits and crudities towards better logical statements and a completer moral consistency. Though personal *in form*, the quarrel was purely doctrinal *in essence*. It was, however, none the less irritating on this account; and it is plain from this narrative of Mr. Turner, that he felt not only much aggrieved, but greatly incensed, and that he left Charlestown, convinced that he had been wickedly plotted away, against the decided preference of a majority of the people. And yet, it is believed, no unprejudiced person can read the statement without being impressed with its candor and the faultlessness of its general spirit. It is more at length than could have been desired for these pages; but those who have read the account in the *Life of Ballou* will be glad to have this to place by its side, and their former impressions will hardly fail to be somewhat modified as both parties are heard.

It must in sadness be added that this controversy gave the final blow to the friendship between Mr. Turner and Mr. Ballou. Dr. Whittemore conveys the impression that the latter all this while was cherishing only the tenderest regard for his brother Turner and the rest, and, giving us to understand that the latter were solely responsible for the estrangement, tells us how greatly Mr. Ballou was grieved on account of it. Perhaps he was. But whether correctly or not, it is due to "the truth of history" to say, Mr. Turner held Mr. Ballou largely responsible for his dismissal. He had reason to know, he alleged, that Mr. Ballou was in frequent counsel with those who were prominent in pressing and finally procuring this action. Nor is it necessarily implying anything to the disparagement of Mr. Ballou to say that this was unquestionably the fact. In what veneration the writer holds him as a good as well as a great man, the sketch of

him sufficiently shows. But he was *a man* — and a man of intense will, of dogged purpose, and of a most dogmatic and self-assertive spirit when his combativeness was once aroused. A man to half-believe nothing, he believed — if possible, with more than his whole heart — that his doctrine of no future punishment was true. How he cherished it, even in later years, when the strenuousness and bitterness of the controversy had passed, — how, Cerberus-like, he guarded it, — how, if it was even indirectly challenged, he was on the watch to defend it, and how pertinaciously he pressed it "in season and out of season," those of us associated with him know, and his writings, even down to his *Valedictory*, abundantly show. How, then, must he have battled and wrought for it in the heat of the contest, when the extent of his influence was to be tested by the acceptance it commanded. Having once carried the denomination from its old position in respect to the Trinity, Vicarious Atonement, etc.,[52] he was naturally solicitous to — as he thought — finish the good work he had begun, by doing the same thing again on this new issue to which he had committed himself; and no one who knew him will doubt the intensity of his resolve to accomplish this, if possible. Mr. Turner was the ablest and most influential man in the way of this result. And considering the nature of the controversy, and at what height feeling was then running, and how far the question was one of comparative personal weight

[52] There is no better place than this to give an extract or two from the letters of Mr. Richards to Mr. Turner, showing how Mr. Ballou and his early attempts against these doctrines were regarded by those who held them. Writing July 19, 1805, Mr. R. says:

"Ballou's Parables are duly received. I think there are many things to commend in them, much to be thought of with serious sobriety, and perhaps as little to censure as could be reasonably expected. I am told that he is now writing on the Atonement. I shall like to see it; for Ballou has certainly a strong and a daring mind, and he soars, like the eagle, amid the heavens of invention."

May 4, 1807, he writes:

"With respect to his Treatise on the Atonement, there is much ingenuity, great boldness, some wit, and, I believe, real sincerity; but you know my sentiments too well to suppose that I approve of everything therein. . . It is, however, a popular work among our young preachers, and Kneeland has swallowed it in total."

Again, Nov. 5, 1810, he says:

"I do not find that Ballou was called to the ordination of Mitchell [in Boston, as colleague with Murray], and as a late letter from Brother John [Murray] expresses his joy at having got rid of 'a *Socinian, Deistical, Sadducean Universalist*,' I have thought whether he did not thus point to a certain neglected individual."

between these two men, it is simply impossible that Mr. Ballou should not have thought it desirable that Mr. Turner should be unseated at Charlestown, or that he should have failed to be in sympathy with those who had this object in view. They were fighting his battle: why should he not be their counsellor, and wish for their success? It was simply devotion to what was thought to be truth, stimulated by the zeal of the propagandist and intensified by the feeling of the partizan, *versus* personal friendship. And in such an issue, who doubts that personal friendship must go to the wall? That Mr. Ballou did nothing and counselled nothing that, from his point of view, was otherwise than honorable and christian, we may be very sure. "It is not that I love Cæsar less, but Rome more," he doubtless would have said, and said with truth. But that Mr. Turner, from his point of view, should have seen occasion for complaint in what Mr. Ballou thought quite consistent with honor and propriety, we can easily understand. At all events, this is what Mr. Turner alleges that he saw, and what, to appreciate the state of mind into which he was brought, we must believe that he had reason to think he did see. In justice to him, moreover, the significance of that second paragraph of his closing summary should not be overlooked. It could have been no ordinary pressure of what was felt to be injustice and a "domineering" assertion of a supposed advantage or superior prestige, which wrung from a man so calm, so equable, so meek and unimpassioned, those questions, "What more could I do? Was I to crouch —?" and that outburst, "I told them I would not do it if they impaled me!" We may be sure that there must have been a great deal *that was believed to be* unbrotherly and unjust behind *such* language from *such* a man. And so we shall not wonder that the last remnant of the friendship between these two men was destroyed.

As the result of the whole, Mr. Turner went to Portsmouth — sad that he had been driven from his home; indignant at the means by which the result had been accomplished; personally estranged not only from Mr. Ballou, but from others

prominent in the controversy through which he had passed; desponding as he saw the denomination so generally committed to what he thought a morally dangerous error; more positively wedded than ever to his own convictions with respect to future punishment; feeling more than ever that he ought to preach these convictions, and yet conscious that he could not preach them without exciting opposition, and perhaps being again ousted from his home; and underneath all, unpleasantly sensible, no doubt, that he had lost position and influence in the denomination, as one of the issues of his late contest. Then to this it must be added, that while he was greatly beloved as a pastor in Portsmouth, his ministry there could hardly be said to be a success.[53] All these things and

[53] This is sufficiently manifest from the following letters and extracts from the parish records. They are here given to show particularly how conscientious he was, how solicitous not only to do right, but to stand justified in the judgment of all with whom he held relations. On this account, they have great interest and value. He writes to the wardens:

"As you have lately seen the official invitation which I have received to become the minister of another society, I consider it proper that you, and the society of which you are the organs, should know why I put that communication into your hands. Though I know that I am under no express obligations to you beyond the present year, yet I have no desire to avail myself of that fact to leave the society without, at least, the consideration of its members, and their decision, as far as they may be able to form one, on the propriety of the measure. I had rather waive the exercise of a privilege, than to give occasion to have it said that I have precipitately done a deed injurious to my charge, without consulting their feelings in the case. Whatever may be my feelings or wishes on the subject of removing from this place, I am willing, if I know my own heart, that the views of those with whom I am now associated should have their due weight in forming my final determination. I consider it an object of much consequence to decide what will, in all probability, contribute to the prosperity of the cause in which we are engaged; and in settling a question of this magnitude, I feel that I have need of all the aid which my friends can give, and I am persuaded hat they are able to yield me considerable assistance.

The salary I have received from your society has been satisfactory. I have never required an addition to it, nor suggested that I desired any to be made. Nor do I wish that this communication of my request for your advice should be construed nto an indirect intimation that I now require more than I receive as an inducement to remain with you. Nothing could be further than this from my heart. But the society knows its own resources, prospects, and real situation better than I can know them, and I doubt not will act in this case with equal regard to my interests as to its own."

This letter was read at a parish meeting, Dec. 10th. Thereupon a Committee was appointed to "confer with Bro. Turner upon the subject of the foregoing communication," and they soon reported that "they had visited Mr. Turner, and had had a conversation with him." They continued:

"We understand him to say that it was [is] not his wish to leave us, but as he had heard that there was some disaffection expressed by some individuals of the society, and as he had had an invitation from a society in Massachusetts, and not knowing how extensive this disaffection might be, he communicated to the wardens for advice upon the subject. And in the event that the wardens should think the disaffection to be so extensive that the society would not be able to support him hereafter — that it would be his duty to accept this invitation — if by so accepting it the welfare of his society should sustain no material injury."

their inevitable effect upon him being duly considered, it is not perhaps surprising, that when the opportunity came for him to go to his old home in Charlton, under arrangements promising a pleasant abiding place for the rest of his days, — in relations in which he could preach as his con-

A vote, 38 to 10, was then passed, requesting Mr. Turner not to accept the invitation from Charlton.

Subsequently, March 24th, 1828, the following communication was presented at a parish meeting:

"*To the Universalist Society in Portsmouth:*

RESPECTED AND BELOVED BRETHREN, — It having been intimated to me that some members of the society are impressed with the idea that in leaving my station as minister of the society, I had not acted with the propriety which the case demanded — that I was too precipitate in giving an answer to the call which I had received from Charlton, and consequently had not regarded the social interests of my brethren in Portsmouth, I take this method to state to you collectively, what I have often stated to several individually, with the hope that my remarks may satisfy those who are not already convinced of the rectitude of my conduct.

On receiving an invitation to settle in Charlton, I immediately gave the communication to the wardens of the society. I did this, knowing the fact, that at the end of the current year, I had a right to leave the society, and might do it without a breach of contract. I gave the communication to the wardens that the society might have a voice in the decision of the question, whether I should tarry here, or accept the call of another society. In bringing this question before you, I did not wish to ascertain merely whether a MAJORITY were satisfied with my services, for this I had no reason to doubt; but whether, *under all existing circumstances, my friends should think my tarrying here was advisable.* The facts and the circumstances which would very naturally be considered, and have weight and influence in forming a decision in this case, are too well known to require to be mentioned in this communication. The observations and the statements of several active, leading members of the society finally fixed my determination to accept the call from Charlton. Those observations and statements went to show *that the state of the society* could not warrant my *neglecting the offer of a settlement in another place, and that even friendship and attachment would be best exhibited in concurring with the wishes of the society who had called me to be their minister.*

I believe, brethren, that in similar circumstances most men would have acted as I have done. If I have erred, my error was not intentional. I had no strong desire to leave this place. I could have spent my remaining life here, had not the remarks alluded to above, added to facts within my own knowledge and experience, led me to decide (I will say conscientiously) as I have done.

If these statements should prove satisfactory, it will gratify me very much if the society will pass a vote or resolution, expressing their views of the subject, and serve me with a copy of the same.

With respect and affection,

Your servant and brother, EDWARD TURNER.

Portsmouth, N. H., March 24, 1828."

After the foregoing communication was read, the following Preamble and Resolutions were unanimously adopted, viz:

"It having been intimated to the Reverend Mr. Turner that some members of the society were impressed with the idea that in leaving his station as minister of this society, he had not acted with the propriety which the case demanded, it is therefore,

Resolved unanimously, as the opinion of this meeting, That we have no reason to complain of Mr. Turner in relation to his negotiations with the society at Charlton, nor of his acceptance of their invitation to become their pastor.

Resolved unanimously, That Mr. Turner is justly entitled to our respect and consideration, and that we heartily join in the expression of our best wishes for his future welfare and prosperity.

Resolved, That the clerk furnish Mr. Turner with an official copy of the foregoing resolutions."

science dictated, without disturbance or complaint, he should have thought himself in the way of duty to accept it. The feelings with which he went will appear from the following extract from a letter to Rev. L. Willis, written July 10, 1828, immediately after his removal:

"Though I am now placed among those who bear another name, I shall ever cherish the same fraternal sentiments towards my brethren, . . . from whom I have received proofs of kind feelings. . . . Names become every day more and more stale and insignificant with me; but the associations which I formed in my early professional life, and which have been continued during 30 years, are not easily broken. Nor do I wish they should be. Certainly there is no cause for a division in principle because, in the course of human affairs, men are ranked under different names. . . . The believers in immediate . . felicity and restorationists cannot well continue connected. . . . The first are determined that there shall be no misery nor punishment beyond this life; and the preachers impress their hearers in a way which makes our general [i. e. the restorationist] doctrine abhorrent to their feelings. Hence arise collisions, heart-burnings, and ill-natured remarks, which make the lives of our preachers unhappy, and much of their preaching quite useless."

Having lost faith in the honorable destiny or further usefulness of our denomination, he naturally went, as he thought, to do more good in the new connection inviting him.

Alas, that his usually cool, clear judgment should have been so misled! He should have looked deeper. Like Samuel C. Loveland, Dolphus Skinner, Lemuel Willis, Hosea Ballou 2d, Russell Streeter, and others holding the same general views, he should have had more confidence in the great underlying principles of his faith, and should have wrought on in the assurance that the tendency he deprecated, so far as it was wrong, would ere long expend itself, and that the pendulum would in due time swing to the centre. A failure to perceive this was the grand oversight of all those who with him thought a division of the denomination inevitable. Important principles, certainly, there were involved in the issue between them and Mr. Ballou. But as regards the essential

ideas our Church stands for, these principles were simply incidental; and time, as the rule, tolerates no issue made on mere incidentals. If anything in the way of effort or organization is to live long in this world, it must have some live fundamental principle at the bottom of it. As might have been expected, therefore, when the rupture which was threatened in 1823, occurred in 1831, it was short-lived, and ended in a mortifying failure. With this, however, Mr. Turner had no connexion, his separation having been complete in 1828.

Of course the secession of such a man could not fail to attract attention and excite comment. The *Southern Association*, which he had helped to organize, and of which he had been one of the most valuable members, condemned his conduct; and concerning nothing, except his dismissal from Charlestown, does he exhibit so much feeling as concerning this action. I find this entry in one of his note-books:

"June 14, 1828. This day I received information that the Southern Association of Universalists . . . passed a vote of censure or disapprobation on me for connecting myself with the Unitarians, and settling over a Unitarian society. This act of the Association is in perfect keeping with its other proceedings in past times. What had the Association to do with me in relation to my conduct in leaving their connexion? I never promised, when I joined their connexion, that I would continue in it to the end of my life. The brethren had not labored with me to prevent my leaving their connexion. Was it expected that I should ask permission to leave the Universalists for some other order? This would imply a subjection which I disclaim. It would imply, too, that they had a right to deny my request. I deny that they, or any other religious order, possess that right. The whole subject is resolvable into this: If I had a right to separate myself from the Universalists, then they had no right to make the separation a matter of censure. To censure a man for the exercise of an inalienable right, a sacred privilege, a part of his birthright as a Christian, is absurd. I learn that the Association have referred the subject to the consideration of the next Convention. I am glad of it. There will be men there, who I hope will better understand the rights of conscience, than the members of the Southern Association."

Substantially the same things are said, with equal warmth, in several letters before me, written shortly after. But all this is sad reading to one who loved Mr. Turner, only showing how the clearest head becomes confused when once committed to a wrong course. He failed to see the point of his condemnation. That he had a right to change his relations, no one denied; but had he a right, while in the fellowship of the Universalist Denomination, to settle over a parish in a town where a Universalist society existed, and where one of the purposes contemplated by those who called him, doubtless, was to weaken, and perhaps destroy, this Universalist society? This is quite another question; and judged in the light of this question, while the purity of his motives is not to be doubted, Mr. Turner was clearly and very greatly in the wrong. For what are denominations, and denominational rules, and the obligations to denominational courtesy and loyalty worth if they are thus, at the option of any man, to be disregarded? Having determined that his duty called him "to leave the Universalists for another order," Mr. Turner owed it to himself, and to the brethren with whom he had so long been associated, and to everything like Christian comity under the rules which no man had done more than he to establish, first of all to surrender his Universalist fellowship and to ask a discharge from the obligations he had thus assumed; and it will always stand as an occasion of serious regret (not to use a stronger word), at the close of his otherwise honorable Universalist record, that he failed to do this.[54]

[54] The following is the Resolution passed by the Association, as I find it in one of Mr. Turner's note-books:

"*Voted unanimously*, That notwithstanding we individually disapprove the conduct of Rev. Edward Turner, in placing himself at the head of a society in Charlton, which is in opposition to the Universalist society in that place, and in connexion with a body which disclaims all fellowship with the order of Universalist Christians, this Association submits the consideration of the subject to the General Convention."

The view which the Association took is well presented in letters to Mr. Turner from Rev. S. Cobb, which I find among the papers in my hands. He says:

"The case as it stood before us may be thus stated: A Universalist minister, in full connection with the Universalist order of Christians, had consented to take the lead . . . of a party in Charlton, against the interest of a society in the same place which was in our fellowship, and the interest of which he was of course under solemn obligation to aid." "We did not consider you as having separated yourself from

Results in due time attested how seriously he had erred in the step thus taken, practically as well as theoretically. Beyond question, his purpose in what he did was good; nor is there anything to show that he ever regretted his course. But it proved the great mistake of his life, from which he never recovered. He left us at 52, just in the meridian of his powers and of his possible usefulness. Doubtless, for the moment, as the current was running, his influence was affected. But it can hardly be said that he was *second* to any man in the regards and confidence of our people. His position as a preacher might have been somewhat qualified by his growing "moderation," as age came on; but had he seen it to be his duty to remain with us, nothing could have deposed him from that prominent position which he had so long occupied, as one of the central figures in our affairs; and after the little gust of feeling growing out of the "controversy" had passed, how he would have been beloved by us all! How his counsels would have been prized and sought! How his sweet face and benign presence would have been welcomed at our gatherings! What weight there would

our connexion. . . . We do not contend that you ever put yourself under obligation to aid the interests of the Universalist order as long as you live; but we do contend that when one comes into the fellowship of our Convention, he comes under a particular obligation to aid our common cause; and that this obligation continues as long as he continues in our connexion. And if you judge that you have a right to exert your influence either *for* or *against* our order, as you choose, *before* you take up your connexion with us, we judge that we have a right to express to the world our approbation or disapprobation of the course you take. . . . I *know* that the Association recognized the principle you contend for — that one has a right to withdraw from our connexion without being censured for it; and the consideration of your case was put off from the first to the second day, with the hope that before the close of the session, we should receive from you some communication which would relieve us from the disagreeable necessity of maintaining the credit and discipline of our order by a vote of disapprobation."

It is due to Mr. Turner to add that I find also a copy of one of his letters to Rev. Mr. Cobb, in which he says:

— "asking to be dismissed is an act merely formal. . . . I intended, and still intend, to take up my connexion with your order at the meeting of [the] Convention. This I should have had to do, even if I had applied to the Southern Association. I have purposely avoided increasing the number, and consequent trouble, of such formal transactions."

And that the intention he thus intimated was duly acted upon appears from the following entry in the Minutes of the Session at Cavendish, Vt., 1828, *Manuscript Records of the Convention:*

"Received a request from Rev. Edward Turner, that his connexion with this body be dissolved: — Whereupon

Voted, That said request be granted."

have been in his voice! And how, side by side with Father Ballou, he would have stood through the years, making us all glad that he was so long spared to us, and commanding the affectionate homage of our hearts, as dear, venerable, apostolic Father Turner — until, at last, a whole church would have followed him reverently to his grave, mourning his loss, but thanking God for his example and his work! But he went from us — and it was to him as if the sun should leave the heavens at noon-day. Except in narrow circles, he was nevermore seen nor heard of. His anticipations in going to Charlton, as we saw, ended in three years in utter disappointment, and most unexpectedly he again found himself abruptly dismissed — and adrift. There were no "old associations" to give him position, or to make him dear among the Unitarians, even if there had been no jealousies or prejudices (as there then probably were), to cause him to be coldly regarded or put aside. As the consequence, he seems to have been for some months without any regular engagement. He was then sent out for a season among the skirmishers on the outskirts; returning, he was buried for years in an obscure village, preaching to a handful; and finally, after a period of transient "supplies," for the most part in small and out-of-the-way places, he was practically "shelved" while yet there was not a little of good work in him. In a question of duty, of course, no consideration of consequences can be allowed to enter; but I confess I always sigh and am heavy of heart as the face of this lovely old man comes to me, and I thus think of what *was* — so in contrast with what *might have been.*

But the glory of EDWARD TURNER was in nothing that he was intellectually, and was grandly independent of circumstances, and of all considerations of actual or possible position. It was in his elevated and saintly character. This shed a light that no circumstances could obscure, and diffused a power that made him beneficently felt, however inconspicuous or humble the position to which he might be consigned. Rev. L. Willis, who knew him intimately for

years, writes me of him, "Take him in all regards, I will say that I never knew a man who so completely answered my ideal of an apostle." And this is in substance the invariable testimony concerning him. Everybody agrees that he was *a good man*. To this, indeed, there is one exception. On the authority of the uneasy meddler who fomented the disturbance, he has gone into our history as actuated in the "Declaration and Appeal" solely by "envy," and as saying that if harmony continued in the denomination, "there would be nobody but Ballou."[55] That Mr. Wood so reported, there seems no reason to doubt, in view of the testimony cited; but even though there were no other evidence in the case, he is, as against such a character as Mr. Turner's, utterly discredited as a witness by those who introduce him, since *they* show him to have been entitled to no confidence. There *is* other evidence, however. That Wood spoke truly for himself, as to the motives alleged, we can readily believe. Perhaps it must be confessed that he spoke with some truth for Mr. Dean. But as regards Mr. Turner, it must be said, not only that he has been held altogether too largely responsible for these papers[56] and the controversy they kindled, but that it is simply impossible that any such motive could have influenced him, unless his whole nature was for the time changed; unless he could have preached year after year, giving no sign of the spirit that possessed him; unless his letters even to those nearest to him were part of a constant game of deceit; and unless for years in his intercourse with his friends his

[55] *Life of Ballou*, Vol. ii., p. 222.

[56] Mr. Hudson writes me:

"We were all sensible at the time that Mr. Turner was not responsible for these papers to the extent that was represented; and we accounted for the fact that he was so assailed, on the ground that he was so situated that he could be made to feel the attack. Several of the leading men of his society were ardent friends of Mr. Ballou, and believers in his peculiar views. Hence it was easy to visit the supposed iniquity upon him, while others more remote could not be reached to any purpose."

In view of this testimony, does not the magnanimity of Mr. Turner shine out with peculiar lustre when, though so improperly held responsible for these papers, he nowhere, not even in his letters to his daughters, is found to breathe a word to evade the responsibility, or to intimate that it belonged to others rather than to him? Agreeing with the general purpose of the papers, he would bear whatever onus of their responsibility was laid upon him, though it crushed him.

heart was always masked. Sermons dated all through the period of this controversy are before me as I write; and I have read with moistened eyes his letters to his children, written subsequently through more than twenty years. But though it is easy to see that his themes of discourse were sometimes selected and discussed with reference to the controversy, and though the letters fail not to give evidence of feeling — sometimes, at first, of strong feeling — on account of the injustice which he alleged had been done him, nowhere is there a word, or the remotest hint, intimating any such base or sinister motive as is laid to his charge. On the contrary, it is a singularly pure, humble, unambitious heart that is thus revealed, and my reverence for the man, great as it was before, has largely increased as I have thus looked, through these trying years, into his inmost life. It is my privilege to say, moreover, that during his residence in Portsmouth, he was a frequent visitor in our home, and I am assured by my mother that though he often spoke of Mr. Ballou's doctrine, she remembers not even a lisp of envious or unkind feeling toward him personally. To the same effect, Rev. L. Willis writes me, "Whether in after years, when he could see the result of the movement as it stood in history, he could justify the 'Declaration and Appeal,' I know not; but I always thought he acted conscientiously. He was a man of too saintly a character — of too much honesty of purpose, to give countenance to anything he did not regard as right;" and Mr. Hudson, the sole survivor of the six, who was thoroughly posted in all the facts, personally assures me that not only was Mr. Turner incapable of envy, or any base ambition, but that it is within his certain knowledge that he was prompted by no such motive.[57] That he committed mis-

[57] Mr. Hudson has kindly sent me a portraiture of his friend, which, though it touches some points perhaps sufficiently presented in the body of this paper, and is longer than I could wish, is so just and appreciative that I cannot deny myself the pleasure of appending it here. It is as follows:

"Rev. Edward Turner may justly be regarded as a superior man. Intellectually or morally he had few equals. Modest and unpretending, he was blessed with quick perception and a clear, philosophical mind, which would lead him to detect sophistry, and bring him almost unerringly to just conclusions. His high moral sense and his perception of right were as unerring as his intellect. Hence he was almost

takes in judgment — in this as in other matters — some serious mistakes, is quite probable.[58] That he allowed himself to be drawn into and to sanction measures set on foot by the restless and designing Wood, which he never himself would have initiated, and which can now be looked back upon only with regret, is, I have no doubt, true. In some moment of

always found on the right side of all moral questions. He was, morally and intellectually, of such a cast, and acted so uniformly on fixed principles, that one could predict with great certainty how he would stand on any new question, and how he would act in any given case. Naturally conservative, he would adhere to the old system till he could discover a 'more excellent way.' But his conservatism was not of that obstinate kind which remains idle, and faults all who are seeking after truth. He was an honest inquirer; and becoming convinced of a new truth, he was free to declare, and willing to defend it, whether it were popular or unpopular. Never dogmatic, he would state his opinions with a clearness and candor which carried a conviction of his sincerity, and neither flattery nor fear could move him from his position.

"As a man, he was honest, frank, and genial. Hence his society was sought, and he was a welcome guest in any family where he was known. He had great conversational power; and a vein of quiet humor added attraction to his social intercourse, and gave him many personal friends and admirers alike among the aged and the young. He was a pattern of christian humility, meekness, and sobriety, and in all respects adorned the clerical profession. In his pastoral duties he was faithful to his flock. His ear was ever open to their call, and his sympathy was extended to all classes. As a preacher, he was serious and dignified, and his discourses were generally of a practical character. Though his manner was marked by a sincere earnestness, it was wanting in that force which generally passes for strength, and in that fire which is often regarded as piety. Hence his preaching was not particularly attractive to a portion of his audience. But while the gay and thoughtless were not altogether gratified, and zealous partizans thought him too tender of the feelings, and too sparing of the errors, of the dominant sects, the more serious portion of his congregation, who attended church to be instructed and made better, were generally pleased with his labors. His sermons frequently partook of a philosophical cast, and were remarkable for strength and clearness. We have also heard him when he not only exhibited great strength of mind, but beauty of expression and a *force of delivery* which constitutes one of the qualities of *true eloquence*. He was a man of literary tastes and studious habits. He was well read in philosophy as well as in general history. He was familiar with the standard works of the different sects, and knew well their views on the various points of controverted theology. His goodness of heart specially appeared in the kind and parental feeling he manifested towards all the young men entering the ministry. They found themselves ever welcome at his house; and knowing the privations of a life of itineracy, and the uncertain subsistence it afforded, he would spare no pains to promote their prospects, and to aid them in obtaining fields of labor. Many a young preacher has been saved from despondency, and been encouraged to persevere by his generous sympathy and fatherly advice; and many a fervent prayer has been breathed, and many a throb of gratitude has been felt, by those who have partaken of his hospitality, as they have recalled this sainted man and his ever sympathizing family.

"Mr. Turner was highly respected and greatly esteemed by all who knew him. As a man, he was above reproach; as a friend, he was true and faithful — most highly prized by those who knew him best; and in all his domestic relations, he was spotless. His ministerial character was endorsed even by his theological opponents. For though they condemned his doctrines, they had respect for his life; and though they regarded him a heretic in faith, they were willing to count him a Christian in practice."

[58] Writing to Rev. H. Ballou 2d., March 4, 1823, after the "first settlement with the Editors" had been repudiated, and when he was trying to negotiate some other, Mr. Turner says:

"I am willing to acknowledge my own liability to error and misconception; and that misapprehension and mistake may have had influence upon me is natural enough. . . You also have conceded the same on your part."

confidence, when discussing the results to which things seemed to be tending, he may even have said something out of which the remark attributed to him was manufactured, meaning only that if things continued as they were going, the influence of Mr. Ballou would become paramount, and his ideas take entire possession of the denomination. Too honest and simple-minded to think of self-seeking or double dealing himself, he was slow to suspect it in others; and yielding his confidence too easily to Wood, he was just the kind of man whose conscientious devotion to principle the latter would play upon and use for ends of his own. But so far as his personal spirit and purpose were concerned, it is believed that few men have ever lived who could more unreservedly throw their whole being open, and appeal to God for justification. His thoughts never were of himself, nor of his position as compared with others, but always for the truth; — his care only that the interests of souls and the cause of Christ should not suffer.

Mr. Turner doubtless had his weaknesses; inasmuch as he was human, he probably had his faults. But it is rare to find one better deserving to be called a pattern Christian. A man of peculiarly fine and sensitive nature, he was also a man of imperative conscience; of great depth and tenderness of sympathy; with an almost feminine delicacy of feeling; disinterested; single in aim, and pure in purpose; with an inexhaustible kindness of heart; of profound reverence and spiritual sensibility; and added to all the rest, with a faith in God that nothing could shake, and a devout religiousness that flavored and chastened his whole character into saintliness and beauty. Numerous passages have been marked in his letters as expressions of what he was. Let the following serve as examples. Writing to his daughters after his abrupt dismission at Charlton, not knowing where he was to go, he says:

"It ill becomes us to contemplate events on the dark side only, though indeed sometimes it is the only side which we can survey, till 'light arises from obscurity' and shows what

a benignant Providence has wisely concealed from us for a time. Even in the midst of darkness, our duty and interest consist in giving exercise to humble confidence, rather than in lamenting our destitution of knowledge. I am much pleased with a remark of Dr. Hunter, in his Sacred Biography. . . . 'I like,' says the Doctor, — I quote from memory — 'to see a disposition to give a favorable construction to the dealings of Providence. I am gratified with the evidence of a firm confidence in the goodness of that Being who often converts the causes of our present sorrows into sources of the purest joy.'"

To a son-in-law, sick, he writes:

"I am happy to learn that you have borne this afflictive visitation with calmness and submission, and I hope your mind will continue to possess the happiest equanimity. Equanimity is to the mind, what perpendicularity is to an edifice. The structure that leans not to either side will stand long, when otherwise decayed. . . . You have, my son, read and heard, and I hope felt, enough of the salutary truths of religion to know their power. I have reason to believe that in pain or weakness you will be able to recognize the dealings of a Father in the chastisements of your God, . . and that you will cherish the resignation which furnishes a remedy for the ills we are doomed to suffer.

'Earth has its cares for all; the happiest breast
Not his who *fears* them *least*, but *bears* them *best*.'"

Writing to a daughter, who had suffered repeated bereavements, on the death of a child, he says:

"We again suffer an affecting disappointment; but we cannot mourn for the departed. They may even now be looking down upon us with angelic pity, . . and cherishing the joyful expectation of greeting our arrival at the abodes of bliss which they have happily reached before us. Our grand concern lies in improving the repeated corrections of our God to a preparation for eternity, in 'learning obedience by the things we suffer,' and in cultivating the dispositions and affections that will qualify us for the heavenly world. . . . I am confident that . . having found strength and comfort in Him who has *peculiarly* afflicted you, you will not now abandon the rock of your defence, nor 'cast away your confidence' that has afforded you so 'great a

recompense of reward.' — Dr. Young has beautifully said, 'Our dying friends come o'er us like a cloud.' This I often experience. I think I possess a tolerable equable mind. But there are moments, A—, when sleeping or waking, the assembled images of the much loved dead pass before me in all their corporeal and mental loveliness; and the survey which my imagination takes . . wrings my soul with anguish. I do not court these images. They come not by the action of the common laws of association. They 'come o'er me like a cloud,' and like a cloud, too, they give a sombre coloring to the whole face of nature, while there is still light enough to show me the ruin of my fondest earthly hopes, the utter wreck of my highest expectations. But . . I bless God that I, that you, that all of us are so kindly supported under our augmented sorrows; that so many enjoyments are still left us."

Announcing his decision to leave Fishkill, and speaking of the uncertainty of finding employment, he writes:

"I think I shall find some employment; but if I do not, I shall consider it an indication that my mission is fulfilled, and that my Master has no further service for me. In a word, as I am conscious of acting conscientiously, I shall not allow myself to distrust the benignant Providence which has always done so much 'better for me than I could ask or think.' I should wish to be employed while I am thought able to do any good, even if only as a supernumerary, in destitute societies. I know I am advanced in life; but I do not think myself so superannuated as to be incapable of the duties of my profession. Of all this, however, the people will judge. Ministers have to act according to the old maxim, 'Vox populi, vox dei.'"

Finally: writing of a place where he had been "candidating," he says:

"There was much conversation made with me by the leading men of the society, on the subject of my coming there; but whether anything will be done to bring it about, I cannot tell. Nor shall I give myself any anxiety concerning it, as this would do nothing to forward the object in view. I shall return home and await events, which . . are in the hands of One whom we ought to trust with perfect confidence.

The idea of being 'an old minister' gives me no trouble. It affects me neither with envy nor jealousy. If I know myself, I am glad that others are coming upon the stage, who will *more* than fill the places of their predecessors. Just so it should be. It is the order of Providence. I should like to spend my remaining days in the profession of my choice. . . . A review of my life convinces me that I have been favored by Providence beyond my most sanguine expectations when I entered on my profession. I have had, and still have, many good friends. I hope I have but few real enemies. I have had, and believe I shall have, a comfortable living. I have had some troubles in my ministerial concerns, which, unless I am deceived, arose from a conscientious adherence to what I consider truth. I do not regret them, nor the courses which brought them upon me."

These, it is evident, are the unstudied utterances of a soul peculiarly docile, humble, reverent, and tranquil, — habitually centered on God, — with none of the dreams, regrets, or jealousies of personal ambition, and thoroughly schooled in trust and patience and the consciousness of heaven. What such a man must have been as a pastor hardly need be said. It was not in him to be otherwise than thoughtful and faithful. Children were instinctively drawn to him as one whom they knew to be their lover and friend; and wherever there was a call for his word or his work as the counsellor, and especially as the comforter, of his people, it never failed to be sympathetically given. It was mainly because of what he thus was as pastor to me and mine that I so hold him in loving remembrance and veneration. As has before been said, I was too young when he was in Portsmouth to remember his *preaching*. But I remember his face; the aroma of saintliness I breathed in his presence; the atmosphere which enveloped me as I sat an interested listener to his talk whenever I chanced to be at home at his calls. Above all do I remember what he was in our darkened home as I lay, during the oppressive heats of the summer of 1825, hovering on the brink of death, unspeakably sad of heart as well as languishing in bodily weakness, under the affliction which has

ever since been my great cross, and which doubtless changed the whole current of my life. There were many ministering in kindly offices about me then, whom I shall never forget — among the best remembered of whom, it may be allowed me to say, as showing how the spirit of the husband and father pervaded the whole family, were Mrs. Turner and her sweet-faced daughter "Amy;" but save only those of my parents, no faces linger in my memory so distinctly as those of my pastor and my school-teacher. The latter was a young man; but his very name has ever since been sacred to me, made so by the tenderness of his sympathy and the warmth of his affectionate care. Almost every day he came with some pleasant word or little gift; and lying down by my side, where I could catch the glow of his sunny, smiling face, or feel his cheek against mine, he would take my hand, or gently stroke my hair, and tell me to cheer up, and to be brave and hopeful, because of course I was to live, and to be somebody yet, though I had met with so great a loss. And then, "Father Turner" — how considerate; how benignant; how assiduous; how kind; how ready to be brother and helper to my parents, in their weakness and need; how ready to be my attendant, my comforter, my more than friend in his fatherly interest and unwearied solicitude! Even now my mother seldom speaks of what he and his family were to us in those sad days without a choking voice; and ever since, as I have thought of the angels, his face has been to me the type of theirs. O pastors, — teachers; do not neglect the children. Out of the depths of my own experience, I tell you *they never forget*. Through eternity the faces of that dear pastor and that genial, thoughtful young teacher will live in my heart, associated with those of my father and mother.

The reader will pardon this obtrusion of the writer into a record in which only the subject, and not the writer, should appear. But in this case, the writer brings himself for the moment into view solely that he may better present the subject, and indicate in the hold this good man had, and ever

will have, on one of the families among the many that called him pastor, the quality of his character, the spirit in which he addressed himself to his responsibilities, and the natnre of his influence everywhere. Would that he could have seen it to be consistent with his duty to have remained with the church of his early love, and to have given the harvest of his experience and power, and the serene evening of his days, to the furtherance of the cause to which the morning of his life was so conscientiously devoted! Would that even to the end he might have stood where he belonged, in the company of the sturdy and faithful men by whom our annals are adorned and sanctified! But let it never be forgotten that during his best years, he *was* ours, second to no other in ability, faith, zeal, and consecration; — that as a Church, we are, under God, what we are to-day, to no small extent because of his wise and earnest labors; and that though in a mistaken estimate of duty, as we believe, he separated from us, his name can never be taken out of our records as one of the worthiest of our early heroes; nor his work cease to be an occasion of gratitude and honorable pride to us; nor his reverent and saintly character fail to be one of the most precious portions of our denominational inheritance, standing evermore an illustration of what Universalism becomes when put into life, and thus a source of perpetual spiritual fragrance in our history.

Article XIII.

Dr. Williamson and his Reviewer.

Rudiments of Theological and Moral Science. By Rev. I. D. Williamson, D. D.
Dr. Williamson's Rudiments. A Review, by Rev. T. J. Sawyer, D. D.

It was frequently remarked in former days, and doubtless the same view is entertained by many at this day: that Universalism needs no Philosophy. If it is to be understood by

this that Christianity is not a system of speculation merely; that theology is quite different from metaphysics; or that religion, properly speaking, is not philosophy, the opinion is eminently correct. But if it is intended by this sentiment, that God's Providence in history, gradually culminating in the revelation of Jesus Christ, is based upon no fundamental, rational principles, which theology, as such, has always to presuppose, and which, to a very great extent, must determine the complexion of theology itself, the view must be set down as extremely erroneous. It is erroneous, too, if it is imagined that ever a system of theology gained currency among men, which had not, consciously or unconsciously, certain speculative ideas at its base, giving specific character and direction to the entire theory. It is no less an error to suppose that Universalism can become a *system*, strictly so termed, having organic unity and consistency; can become in any sense a scientific theology without the aid of certain speculative base-lines to work from, that shall serve as the formative principle in the process of its development. Universalism certainly cannot well avoid the question which regards the relations of God to humanity; or, more definitely, the *union of God with humanity;* yet this one question involves nearly all those profound and difficult problems which have occupied the attention of philosophers from the earliest ages. With Universalism, therefore, the same as with every other theological scheme, it is merely a matter of choice; not whether it will have a philosophy or no, for such it must have, either consciously or unconsciously; but whether it will accept the solution of those profound speculative problems just alluded to, as afforded by the current philosophical systems, or will attempt in a measure independently a solution of its own. Presenting, as it does, such a contrast with prevailing systems of theology, both in its spirit and its distinctive doctrines, the Universalist theology will doubtless find itself necessitated, in order to maintain thorough consistency, and to attain in any sense a scientific character, to work out independently also, some of those problems that

pertain more especially to speculative philosophy. A positive tendency on our part to ignore such a task would only demonstrate our inability fully to recognize and to accomplish our true mission as a distinct sect.

The work whose title we place at the head of this article, has at least the merit of distinctly perceiving, and of attempting to perform, in some particulars, this duty which Universalism imposes upon its best thinkers; of modifying current philosophy, in some respects, the better to comport with the essential spirit and doctrines of our denominational theology. We regret that the author did not make this attempt with respect to several other speculative principles; as, for instance, the so-called "philosophy of the unconditioned." However, his aim was not, of course, to write wholly a new philosophy. The work before us, taken in connection with the review of it, also already referred to at the head of our article, very plainly evinces one fact: — instead of having no philosophy, Universalism even now may boast two quite divergent and contradictory systems. To be sure, the Reviewer seems to think that his system has by far the numerical advantage at the present time; but this is not to say, we fear, and judging from the Review itself, that it has the logical advantage. We would not, however, seem to forestall the reader's judgment on such a point; but shall proceed rather, so far as our ability goes, and the space of a tolerably short article will allow, with an impartial and somewhat critical examination of both, the work before us, and the review of it.

Dr. Williamson has always entertained considerable favor toward the Scottish metaphysics; and, in his "Rudiments," he at once takes the position which characterizes the more modern phase of the "Philosophy of Common Sense," as expounded by Sir William Hamilton, and interpreted and applied by Mr. Mansel, in his "Limits of Religious Thought." This "philosophy of the unconditioned," as it is often termed, is not the point of view from which we should choose to discuss those topics that are treated in the "Rudiments." So far from having any faith in it, we believe it the duty and

interest of Universalists to refute it. As a simple regulative, or as a caution against extravagant and lawless speculations, it is quite well enough. But that "web of contradictions" which Mr. Mansel has so patiently and dexterously woven for his readers, pertains exclusively to the *understanding*, as distinguished from *pure reason;* for it is the province of reason to comprehend in higher unity, what the understanding, with its mere generalizations and abstractions, has put asunder and arrayed in antagonistic relations. But we can well pardon Dr. Williamson for having assumed the "Limitation Theory" for his stand-point, since it was not his aim directly to write a new philosophy, but rather to proceed, for the most part, on the basis of current systems of speculation; and since, especially, he has so frequently and skillfully turned the limitation principle itself against those very dogmas, in whose interest it was Mr. Mansel's sole aim to apply it.

Having announced briefly in the first chapter of the "Rudiments," that his purpose was to treat upon Theology, considered as the Divine Science, and not upon Anthropology, which, at best, is but human science; that, consequently, the appeal must be to revelation, instead of to reason, as alone affording that knowledge of God on which to construct the divine science; our author proceeds in the second chapter to a more complete exposition of the grounds already hinted at; to an especial development of the limitation standpoint, from which he proposes to view the entire field of his investigations. The following extract will give the cue to the author's position:

"Infinite, boundless and all-comprehending, therefore, is the existence which has been from eternity; and to this admission we are driven by the laws and limitations of thought. No man who thinks at all can by any possibility think otherwise. Thus far human thought can travel, and thus far we may proceed by the light of human reason, but no further." [1]

Thus much being admitted, the limitation theory necessi-

[1] Rudiments, p. 24.

tates the conclusion that revelation alone affords the adequate knowledge of God, on which to rear the structure of theological science. If we are confined to the more current philosophical systems of our day, there is no doubt that the ultimate of them is just this conclusion and none other, which is so ably developed in the "Limits of Religious Thought." The great merit of Hamilton and Mansel consists in tracing these systems to their last analysis, and then in applying it to theology. No doubt Hamilton was much indebted to Kant for his "philosophy of the unconditioned"; yet it is probable that he never thoroughly understood Kant's principles; for, in such case, he should have seen, just as Fichte, Schelling and Hegel saw, that philosophy henceforth must assume an entirely different starting-point from that previously assumed. But be this as it may; Dr. Williamson has had the sagacity to see that the limitation theory is only the inevitable result of the more current systems of speculation; and he has frequently so manipulated this theory as to completely turn the tables upon those who had thought to make it the bulwark of their cherished dogmas. Whether he maintains an entire consistency with this stand-point, throughout his work, is quite another question. His reviewer, Dr. Sawyer, is confident that he does not: and makes this alleged inconsistency of the author a prominent point of his criticism of the work before us. Reading along through about a hundred pages of the "Rudiments," the reviewer finds his author distinctly admitting that men universally conceive the existence of a power above them, personifying it as Deity. This admission is thought to be wholly inconsistent with Dr. Williamson's first position. We cannot agree with the reviewer in this; for, first, the admission itself is only part and parcel of the limitation theory; and, secondly, that Dr. Williamson is aiming for this theory, as his stand-point, is apparent all through even the first chapter. Beside this, the reviewer needed not to have read so many pages, in order to have found the identical facts admitted, on which the alleged point of inconsistency is based. They are virtually contained in the extract

already presented, drawn from the second chapter. In this chapter, also, the author speaks of the Hindu Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva; of the Persian Ormuzd and Ahriman, etc.; all of them personified deities. But the knowledge of the simple fact of the existence of God, is far from affording the data of a scientific theology. The reviewer's case of inconsistency, then, would seem to consist, first, in a partial misapprehension of the limitation principle, as being the author's proposed stand-point; secondly, in seizing upon an isolated passage of the first chapter, insisting upon *that* as his author's position, without giving him time fully to define it, which is the especial work of the second chapter.

The source from which, perhaps, Dr. Williamson derives his greatest advantage, and draws his most powerful argument, is the ordinary philosophic conception of the Infinite and Absolute, considered as the Cause of all causes, and the sum and substance of all possible existence. The reviewer would seem to regard this position as unauthorized, to say the least; and he thus observes: "*God is*, says Dr. Williamson, and according to his theory there is, properly speaking, nothing else." The following is then cited from the "Rudiments" as illustration: "He is the substance and reality of all things; the life of all life, the fountain of all wisdom, the source of all knowledge, the reality of all goodness, the sum and substance of all that is." The reviewer comments upon the foregoing, something in this style: "If we ask, What, then, does Dr. Williamson mean by creation?—the most natural, if not necessary, answer would be simply, *an emanation* of the material universe, as well as the human soul and all other spiritual natures, from God." "He evidently feels himself exposed to the suspicion of pantheism, but fancies that he avoids the gulf toward which his speculations seem to tend by insisting upon the difference between the absolute and the conditioned." The reviewer concludes his comments on this point by saying: "That the material universe and the human soul are neither God, nor parts of God, may be assumed, we trust, without offence to either reason or revela-

tion, and further than this we do not care to go." The complacency with which, in this last passage, the reviewer convicts his author of heresy, at the same time assuming his own orthodoxy, is hardly justified by the circumstances. His confession a moment before — "We fear this language does not clearly convey any meaning; it is too deep for us, we do not understand it," etc. — should have suggested, we think, the proper course to pursue; namely, not to attempt to implicate an author with pantheistic and emanation tendencies, till you are sure you do understand him. The truth is, that even a tolerable familiarity with the history of speculative opinions should serve to convince one at the first glance that Dr. Williamson's position respecting the Infinite and Absolute, embodied in the foregoing extract, is only the most ordinary view, as held by the wisest and most Christian modern philosophers. Take the subjoined passages from two strenuous advocates of strict liberty of will:

"The metaphysical representation of the Deity, as absolute and infinite, must necessarily, *as the profoundest metaphysicians have acknowledged*, amount to nothing less than the sum of all reality." "That which is conceived as absolute and infinite must be conceived as containing within itself the sum, not only of *all actual*, but of *all possible*, modes of being. For if any *actual* mode can be denied of it, it is related to that mode, and limited by it; and if any *possible* mode can be denied of it, it is capable of becoming more than it now is, and such a capability is a limitation." [2]

Dr. Williamson is thus, according to the above, most fully supported, not only in his position, in itself, but also in his accustomed and most frequent mode of argumentation from that position. His reviewer is thus bound to accept the results arrived at, or, like Mr. Mansel himself, to abjure all reasoning in theological matters. This, unless he is prepared to furnish a definition of the Infinite and Absolute, essentially different from that most current among the philosophers of all ages. But the following from Cousin:

[2] Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought, p. 76.

"He is a God at once true and real, at once substance and cause, always substance and always cause, being substance only so far as cause, and cause only so far as substance; that is, being cause absolute, one of several, eternity and time, space and number, essence and life, *individuality* and *totality*, *principle*, *end*, *midst*, at the summit of being, and at its humblest degree, *infinite* and *finite together*, triple, in fine, that is, *at once God*, *Nature* and *Humanity*." [3]

We suspect Cousin is indebted to Hegel for some of his notions of the Absolute. But Hegel's Absolute, though essentially concrete, is never defined by himself in any such loose and fanciful phrases as we have here. We refer to these writers, both advocates of abstract liberty of will, to show that Dr. Williamson is fully warranted in his position respecting the Infinite and Absolute, and even in his usual method of argumentation from it. The only consistent course for his reviewer was, if he did not understand his author, according to his own confession, then, in so far at least, to let him alone, and not attempt to raise the "hue-and-cry," usual in such cases, of "emanation" and "pantheism." Or, if he did understand him, which we are bound to suppose for the reviewer's own credit, there was left for him just one alternative, — either, with Mr. Mansel, to abjure reason wholly in respect to theology, and so abandon one-half the grounds of Universalism itself; or, to construct a definition of the Infinite and Absolute, quite different from that found in nearly every prevailing system of philosophy. For ourselves, we reject the more current definitions of the Infinite and Absolute, adopting in its main features the only one ever given that did not reduce itself to just that "web of contradictions" which Mansel has exhibited to his readers. We allude here to Hegel's doctrines on these subjects, which neither Hamilton nor Mansel appear to have comprehended. Mansel, at any rate, in his work already referred to, gives Hegel's Absolute and Infinite almost the entire go-by. While upon

[3] Course of the History of Modern Philosophy, translated by O. W. Wight. Vol. i. pp. 112, 113.

this particular topic, however, we should notice another of the reviewer's objections to his author's theory, which has, we think, some grounds. The reviewer objects to his author's views, that they are *mechanical.* Taken as a whole, Dr. Williamson's theory is not such; but there are occasional passages that do savor strongly of mechanical views; and the reason for this is obvious: The usual philosophical conceptions of the Infinite and Absolute, if logically carried out, conduct inevitably to mechanical views of God's Moral Government. On these conceptions, as premises, one must consent to be illogical, inconsistent, if he would avoid such results. But Dr. Williamson is altogether too able, and too conscientious, as a logician, to reason in any such manner. Hence there are some few passages in his recent work, which, in the respect indicated, do injustice to his theory, taken as a whole. The fault, such as it is, cannot justly be attributed to Dr. Williamson; but rather to those premises which he had to accept from current philosophy, or consent himself to write entirely a new philosophy, so far as concerns the majority of his readers. There are also certain inconsistencies in our author's general arguments, attributable to the same source. He speaks of the Deity, or Absolute, as the "Cause of all causes," etc. Now the Absolute, as usually defined, is the *essentially unrelated.* But a *cause,* as such, in so far as it is cause, is by definition essentially *related* to its *effect.* The Absolute, therefore, as the essentially *unrelated*, cannot, as "Cause of all causes," nor as any cause at all, be essentially *related* to creation as *effect.* The doctrine of creation, properly speaking, is utterly excluded by this conception of the Absolute. The reviewer himself, if we may judge from the few hints that have slipped from his pen, were his views of the Absolute definitely stated, and strictly carried out, would be found here in the same identical boat with his author. Hamilton and Mansel both regard creation as having an actual beginning in time, as inconceivable, on philosophical grounds. Hence they would wholly abjure reason, in theological matters. In fact, between the "unconditioned" and

"conditioned" of Hamilton and Mansel, and the same as between the "unknowable" and "knowable" of Spencer, there is no possible logical transition from one to the other.

What Dr. Williamson has to say, respecting Freedom and Necessity, forms the central, culminating point of his entire theories, as embodied in the work before us; and it is as against his author's views upon these topics that the reviewer levels his most determined opposition and most effective logic. Our author has given us a definition of Liberty, which we think was at least worthy of a brief notice from his reviewer. But he does not even condescend to notice it. Nor does he seem to think it necessary or appropriate to give one of his own. On the contrary, he proceeds entirely upon the presupposition, so far as we have discovered, that the term Liberty, or Freedom, has no significance, no application, in connection with the doctrine of Necessity, but only in respect to his own theory. What, then, is Dr. Williamson's notion of Freedom? The following will show:

"The man who is not restrained or hindered by force, or by any arbitrary law, from acting according to the will or choice of his own mind, is as much at liberty as any man can be, and his *liberty consists in the fact that there is an entire absence* of such restraint or hindrance." "Those who insist that the doctrines of divine sovereignty and free agency are both true, . . . have only to accept the above definition, making freedom or liberty of action the mere negation of arbitrary restraint or hindrance from acting according to the choice or will of the mind, and the case is plain and simple." "Thus, for instance, the hold which a child has upon the affections of a mother, is a *controlling power* which calls out and gives direction to action, and may mould and shape the whole history of that mother's life. So, also, the love of a child for a mother may make her slightest wish an imperative law, which shall bind in bands stronger than iron. But in neither of these cases do the parties *feel that they are in bondage.*" "This is liberty, and yet we may see here *control, government of the most absolute and perfect kind.*"[4]

We have collected here several distinct passages, in order

[4] Rudiments, pp. 138, 151.

to exhibit in one view our author's conception of Freedom *and* Necessity, as they stand related to each other. As frequently conceived, Freedom and Necessity are direct opposites. One is control, the other the opposite, the absence of all, except, perhaps, self-control. The two mutually exclude and limit each other. In so far as a man is free, he is not controlled; and in so far as he is controlled, he is not free. There is here, not mere opposition, but absolute and irreconcilable contradiction. Such, as regards Freedom and Necessity, is a statement of the theory of self-determination, so termed, or of abstract liberty of will. But what, in the sphere of the *understanding*, appears as wholly contradictory, the *reason* seeks to grasp in complete, concrete unity. Such, also, is the attempt of Dr. Williamson, in his view already presented of Freedom and Necessity, and of their relations to each other. Whatever others may think, we do not hesitate to say that his views touching these points are the nearest approximation to the absolute truth, that we have ever seen in any author. This assumed entire absence of control is not Freedom, in any true sense of the term. It is not Religious, nor Civil, nor Moral Freedom. Its nearest analogue is the Freedom of the savage; of the tiger, or hyena — bare physical freedom of locomotion without external control. In the sense of the absence of any objective necessity or control, the savage is just as free as the most civilized and Christian man of the age. But this is not Religious, nor Civil, nor Moral Freedom. If so, how absurd for Christ to say, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." It was one of the fundamental doctrines of the old Socratic method, and it is as true to-day as it was then, that any principle, or notion, in order to prove itself correct, must hold good in all of its concrete manifestations. Now this notion of Liberty, as the absence of control or necessity, does not hold good in any of its concrete manifestations; not as Religious, nor Civil, nor Moral Freedom. We have already illustrated incidentally, through the Saviour's language, its essential error considered as Religious Liberty. The same error reveals

itself as respects Civil Freedom. Never was a greater truth uttered than by the first Napoleon, in opposition to the doctrines of the French Illuminati of the last century: "The liberties of the people are never so secure as when authority is firmly established." Here, authority, control, necessity, is seen to constitute the very basis of Civil Liberty. The utter incapacity of the French nation for Liberty consists in this essentially erroneous view of it, as mere self-control, self-determination, the absence of all objective necessity.[5] But we purpose to consider briefly, now, Dr. Williamson's notion of Freedom in its concrete manifestation.

1st. *As Religious, or Gospel Liberty.* The very essence of religion, considered subjectively, as first defined by Schleiermacher, adopted by Neander and many other German divines, but especially carried out and applied to Christianity by Morell, consists in *a feeling of dependence upon God.* Now, *de*pendence is the opposite of *in*dependence, or self-determination; for it presupposes authority, control. In so far as one man really depends on another, he is under the influence, the control of that other. But dependence here is only partial; while complete, absolute dependence is possible in no case, except that of man upon his Maker. In Christianity, therefore, this dependence is conceived as absolute. The question now is, How is this feeling of dependence — in other words, this consciousness of authority and control — at all consistent with Freedom? Is it not subserviency, bondage, slavery, fatalism? We recur to Dr. Williamson's illustration: The child depends upon, is controlled by the mother; yet the child feels perfectly free under this control. The two elements, control, Necessity *and* Freedom, are here completely *mediated*, harmonized and made identical, by a third element — LOVE. We shall now appreciate Morell's state-

[5] The above sentiments were penned during the month of January last. Subsequent events in Paris have afforded a most striking confirmation of the great importance and truth of the principles then advanced. It needs the strong hand of the first Napoleon to deal with such circumstances. He very well realized, what also Napoleon III realized, that France is not fitted for a republic; not even for a constituti na monarchy. Until Illuminism is completely rooted out from her soil, the Empire affords all the liberty France has the capacity to establish and maintain.

ment of the subjective essence of Christianity: "That form of religion in which we are *conscious* of absolute dependence and perfect (absolute) moral freedom, being harmonized by love." It will be seen, thus, that Dr. Williamson's notion of Freedom is precisely the same as that involved in the subjective essence of Christianity. It holds good in the highest possible form of its concrete manifestation as Religious Liberty. But briefly, again, in its concrete manifestation.

2d. *As Civil Liberty.* We have already alluded to the language attributed to the first Napoleon: "The liberties of the people are never so secure as when authority is firmly established." Precisely this, also, is Hegel's conception of *Rational Freedom*, the theory of which is most fully elaborated in his "Philosophy of History." We subjoin a few extracts; first, one from Hegel's translator:

"The aim and scope of that civilizing process which all hopeful thinkers recognize in history, is the attainment of Rational Freedom."[6] The union of Freedom and Necessity in the state is not: "As if the individual, in his relations to other individuals, thus limited his freedom, in order that this universal (mutual) limitation — the mutual constraint of all — might secure a small space of liberty for each (or the absence of control for each, — the notion of Blackstone and all the older jurists). Rather, we affirm, are Law, Morality, Government (control), and they alone, the positive reality and completion of Freedom. Freedom of a low and limited order is mere caprice" (or the freedom of savagism).[7] We must supplement the foregoing by the following from Dr. Hickok: "The sovereignty (self-control) of the individual is anarchy; and this is necessarily the absence of all liberty but the might of the strongest." "All true liberty, thus, must have law."[8]

These writers, contrary to the jurists and moralists of the older schools, distinctly recognize law, authority, control, as the very basis of Civil Liberty. Nothing further is needed,

[6] Hegel's Philos. Hist., Bohn's edit., p. vi.

[7] Ibid. p. 40.

[8] Hickok's Moral Science, pp. 156, 157.

then, by way of illustration of the truth of Dr. Williamson's notions of Freedom and Necessity, in their concrete manifestations as Religious and Civil Freedom. Freedom is essentially, in none of its concrete senses, the absence of Necessity, but the perfect mediation and reconciliation of these two elements, by means of Love; as, *e. g.*, in the family, love of the parent; in Christianity, the love of God, the Divine Parent; in the State, the "law and order" loving citizen, who has, politically speaking, become "a law unto himself." The contrary notion of Freedom, that of self-control, self-determination, is only the essential principle of anarchy, not of government; whether parental, divine or civil government. On the principle that authority, Necessity, is the very basis of Freedom, authority, whether divine, parental or civil, then governs by means of interest, reason, love. On the principle that Freedom is simply the absence of necessity or control, authority does not govern at all; it only puts limits, bounds, to self-government, or self-determination. Here is no possible logical solution of the problem of Freedom and Necessity, except only as it is a kind of compromise between Freedom and Necessity. This last was the theory of Montesquieu and the French publicists of the eighteenth century; of Blackstone and other English jurists; but it has long been abandoned by the best modern writers.

We must here present, concisely as possible, an inspection of the facts of consciousness touching these topics. Every man, then, *feels* free, and this *feeling* is a matter of his consciousness. Let the reader reflect a moment, and see if his consciousness of Freedom really involves anything more, really testifies to anything more, than this *feeling*. Is not this feeling the identical subject matter of consciousness, as it pertains to Freedom? The reader may ask: Does consciousness deceive me? can I possibly *feel* free, when I am not? By no means; it is this very *feeling* which constitutes Freedom. Freedom, in its essence, is emotional; and here we differ from psychologists generally, who make Freedom appertain to the volition or act. Here, too, we should differ

from Dr. Williamson's notion; or rather, as we conceive, define his notion more correctly and critically. Subjectively, Freedom is positive; it is this *feeling*. Objectively, it is negative; it is *un*consciousness of any restraint, or the absence of any feeling of restraint. This is, in more exact terms, we think, Dr. Williamson's idea of Liberty. The essence of slavery, of despotism, on our supposition, does not consist in control, for the loving child is controlled. The slave, the victim of tyranny, is controlled *against his interest and wishes*. Here, instead of the *absence*, we have the *presence* of a feeling of restraint, and this constitutes the slavery. Both Freedom and Slavery are purely emotional. They consist neither in control nor in its absence, so far as that is concerned, but in the nature and character of that control; whether it be consistent or not with the conceived interests and the wishes of the subjects. As regards the theory of self-determination, or of the absence of control, it is impossible for consciousness to testify positively to such a principle. How does one *know*, how can one be *conscious*, that there is not, in the *un*conscious depths of his being, something which controls his volition and act? All that, from the very nature of the case, consciousness can testify to positively, is simply this *feeling* of which we have spoken. What is alleged by self-determinationists, that man is conscious of abstract liberty, *because* he feels responsible for his acts, and attributes them to himself, is something with which consciousness, as such, has nothing to do. It is merely the theorist's logic which he attributes to consciousness — false logic at that.

The doctrine of motives should receive a passing notice here. The mind, in thought, in feeling, or in volition, is not mere *passivity;* the *tabula rasa* of Locke. It is a perfectly elastic power, or a pure activity. We shall borrow an illustration here, from Dr. Marsh, former President of the Vermont University, but long since dead. Take, then, an elastic ball; the reäction, rebound, on the occasion of impact, or concussion, is due wholly to the inherent elasticity; for a non-elastic ball would not thus rebound. Here, now, is not mere

already presented, drawn from the second chapter. In this chapter, also, the author speaks of the Hindu Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva; of the Persian Ormuzd and Ahriman, etc.; all of them personified deities. But the knowledge of the simple fact of the existence of God, is far from affording the data of a scientific theology. The reviewer's case of inconsistency, then, would seem to consist, first, in a partial misapprehension of the limitation principle, as being the author's proposed stand-point; secondly, in seizing upon an isolated passage of the first chapter, insisting upon *that* as his author's position, without giving him time fully to define it, which is the especial work of the second chapter.

The source from which, perhaps, Dr. Williamson derives his greatest advantage, and draws his most powerful argument, is the ordinary philosophic conception of the Infinite and Absolute, considered as the Cause of all causes, and the sum and substance of all possible existence. The reviewer would seem to regard this position as unauthorized, to say the least; and he thus observes: "*God is*, says Dr. Williamson, and according to his theory there is, properly speaking, nothing else." The following is then cited from the "Rudiments" as illustration: "He is the substance and reality of all things; the life of all life, the fountain of all wisdom, the source of all knowledge, the reality of all goodness, the sum and substance of all that is." The reviewer comments upon the foregoing, something in this style: "If we ask, What, then, does Dr. Williamson mean by creation?—the most natural, if not necessary, answer would be simply, *an emanation* of the material universe, as well as the human soul and all other spiritual natures, from God." "He evidently feels himself exposed to the suspicion of pantheism, but fancies that he avoids the gulf toward which his speculations seem to tend by insisting upon the difference between the absolute and the conditioned." The reviewer concludes his comments on this point by saying: "That the material universe and the human soul are neither God, nor parts of God, may be assumed, we trust, without offence to either reason or revela-

tion, and further than this we do not care to go." The complacency with which, in this last passage, the reviewer convicts his author of heresy, at the same time assuming his own orthodoxy, is hardly justified by the circumstances. His confession a moment before — "We fear this language does not clearly convey any meaning; it is too deep for us, we do not understand it," etc. — should have suggested, we think, the proper course to pursue; namely, not to attempt to implicate an author with pantheistic and emanation tendencies, till you are sure you do understand him. The truth is, that even a tolerable familiarity with the history of speculative opinions should serve to convince one at the first glance that Dr. Williamson's position respecting the Infinite and Absolute, embodied in the foregoing extract, is only the most ordinary view, as held by the wisest and most Christian modern philosophers. Take the subjoined passages from two strenuous advocates of strict liberty of will:

"The metaphysical representation of the Deity, as absolute and infinite, must necessarily, *as the profoundest metaphysicians have acknowledged*, amount to nothing less than the sum of all reality." "That which is conceived as absolute and infinite must be conceived as containing within itself the sum, not only of *all actual*, but of *all possible*, modes of being. For if any *actual* mode can be denied of it, it is related to that mode, and limited by it; and if any *possible* mode can be denied of it, it is capable of becoming more than it now is, and such a capability is a limitation." [2]

Dr. Williamson is thus, according to the above, most fully supported, not only in his position, in itself, but also in his accustomed and most frequent mode of argumentation from that position. His reviewer is thus bound to accept the results arrived at, or, like Mr. Mansel himself, to abjure all reasoning in theological matters. This, unless he is prepared to furnish a definition of the Infinite and Absolute, essentially different from that most current among the philosophers of all ages. But the following from Cousin:

[2] Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought, p. 76.

"He is a God at once true and real, at once substance and cause, always substance and always cause, being substance only so far as cause, and cause only so far as substance; that is, being cause absolute, one of several, eternity and time, space and number, essence and life, *individuality* and *totality*, *principle*, *end*, *midst*, at the summit of being, and at its humblest degree, *infinite* and *finite together*, triple, in fine, that is, *at once God*, *Nature* and *Humanity*." [3]

We suspect Cousin is indebted to Hegel for some of his notions of the Absolute. But Hegel's Absolute, though essentially concrete, is never defined by himself in any such loose and fanciful phrases as we have here. We refer to these writers, both advocates of abstract liberty of will, to show that Dr. Williamson is fully warranted in his position respecting the Infinite and Absolute, and even in his usual method of argumentation from it. The only consistent course for his reviewer was, if he did not understand his author, according to his own confession, then, in so far at least, to let him alone, and not attempt to raise the "hue-and-cry," usual in such cases, of "emanation" and "pantheism." Or, if he did understand him, which we are bound to suppose for the reviewer's own credit, there was left for him just one alternative,—either, with Mr. Mansel, to abjure reason wholly in respect to theology, and so abandon one-half the grounds of Universalism itself; or, to construct a definition of the Infinite and Absolute, quite different from that found in nearly every prevailing system of philosophy. For ourselves, we reject the more current definitions of the Infinite and Absolute, adopting in its main features the only one ever given that did not reduce itself to just that "web of contradictions" which Mansel has exhibited to his readers. We allude here to Hegel's doctrines on these subjects, which neither Hamilton nor Mansel appear to have comprehended. Mansel, at any rate, in his work already referred to, gives Hegel's Absolute and Infinite almost the entire go-by. While upon

[3] Course of the History of Modern Philosophy, translated by O. W. Wight. Vol. i. pp. 112, 113.

this particular topic, however, we should notice another of the reviewer's objections to his author's theory, which has, we think, some grounds. The reviewer objects to his author's views, that they are *mechanical*. Taken as a whole, Dr. Williamson's theory is not such; but there are occasional passages that do savor strongly of mechanical views; and the reason for this is obvious: The usual philosophical conceptions of the Infinite and Absolute, if logically carried out, conduct inevitably to mechanical views of God's Moral Government. On these conceptions, as premises, one must consent to be illogical, inconsistent, if he would avoid such results. But Dr. Williamson is altogether too able, and too conscientious, as a logician, to reason in any such manner. Hence there are some few passages in his recent work, which, in the respect indicated, do injustice to his theory, taken as a whole. The fault, such as it is, cannot justly be attributed to Dr. Williamson; but rather to those premises which he had to accept from current philosophy, or consent himself to write entirely a new philosophy, so far as concerns the majority of his readers. There are also certain inconsistencies in our author's general arguments, attributable to the same source. He speaks of the Deity, or Absolute, as the "Cause of all causes," etc. Now the Absolute, as usually defined, is the *essentially unrelated*. But a *cause*, as such, in so far as it is cause, is by definition essentially *related* to its *effect*. The Absolute, therefore, as the essentially *unrelated*, cannot, as "Cause of all causes," nor as any cause at all, be essentially *related* to creation as *effect*. The doctrine of creation, properly speaking, is utterly excluded by this conception of the Absolute. The reviewer himself, if we may judge from the few hints that have slipped from his pen, were his views of the Absolute definitely stated, and strictly carried out, would be found here in the same identical boat with his author. Hamilton and Mansel both regard creation as having an actual beginning in time, as inconceivable, on philosophical grounds. Hence they would wholly abjure reason, in theological matters. In fact, between the "unconditioned" and

"conditioned" of Hamilton and Mansel, and the same as between the "unknowable" and "knowable" of Spencer, there is no possible logical transition from one to the other.

What Dr. Williamson has to say, respecting Freedom and Necessity, forms the central, culminating point of his entire theories, as embodied in the work before us; and it is as against his author's views upon these topics that the reviewer levels his most determined opposition and most effective logic. Our author has given us a definition of Liberty, which we think was at least worthy of a brief notice from his reviewer. But he does not even condescend to notice it. Nor does he seem to think it necessary or appropriate to give one of his own. On the contrary, he proceeds entirely upon the presupposition, so far as we have discovered, that the term Liberty, or Freedom, has no significance, no application, in connection with the doctrine of Necessity, but only in respect to his own theory. What, then, is Dr. Williamson's notion of Freedom? The following will show:

"The man who is not restrained or hindered by force, or by any arbitrary law, from acting according to the will or choice of his own mind, is as much at liberty as any man can be, and his *liberty consists in the fact that there is an entire absence* of such restraint or hindrance." "Those who insist that the doctrines of divine sovereignty and free agency are both true, . . . have only to accept the above definition, making freedom or liberty of action the mere negation of arbitrary restraint or hindrance from acting according to the choice or will of the mind, and the case is plain and simple." "Thus, for instance, the hold which a child has upon the affections of a mother, is a *controlling power* which calls out and gives direction to action, and may mould and shape the whole history of that mother's life. So, also, the love of a child for a mother may make her slightest wish an imperative law, which shall bind in bands stronger than iron. But in neither of these cases do the parties *feel that they are in bondage.*" "This is liberty, and yet we may see here *control, government of the most absolute and perfect kind.*"[4]

We have collected here several distinct passages, in order

[4] Rudiments, pp. 136, 151.

to exhibit in one view our author's conception of Freedom *and* Necessity, as they stand related to each other. As frequently conceived, Freedom and Necessity are direct opposites. One is control, the other the opposite, the absence of all, except, perhaps, self-control. The two mutually exclude and limit each other. In so far as a man is free, he is not controlled; and in so far as he is controlled, he is not free. There is here, not mere opposition, but absolute and irreconcilable contradiction. Such, as regards Freedom and Necessity, is a statement of the theory of self-determination, so termed, or of abstract liberty of will. But what, in the sphere of the *understanding*, appears as wholly contradictory, the *reason* seeks to grasp in complete, concrete unity. Such, also, is the attempt of Dr. Williamson, in his view already presented of Freedom and Necessity, and of their relations to each other. Whatever others may think, we do not hesitate to say that his views touching these points are the nearest approximation to the absolute truth, that we have ever seen in any author. This assumed entire absence of control is not Freedom, in any true sense of the term. It is not Religious, nor Civil, nor Moral Freedom. Its nearest analogue is the Freedom of the savage; of the tiger, or hyena — bare physical freedom of locomotion without external control. In the sense of the absence of any objective necessity or control, the savage is just as free as the most civilized and Christian man of the age. But this is not Religious, nor Civil, nor Moral Freedom. If so, how absurd for Christ to say, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." It was one of the fundamental doctrines of the old Socratic method, and it is as true to-day as it was then, that any principle, or notion, in order to prove itself correct, must hold good in all of its concrete manifestations. Now this notion of Liberty, as the absence of control or necessity, does not hold good in any of its concrete manifestations; not as Religious, nor Civil, nor Moral Freedom. We have already illustrated incidentally, through the Saviour's language, its essential error considered as Religious Liberty. The same error reveals

itself as respects Civil Freedom. Never was a greater truth uttered than by the first Napoleon, in opposition to the doctrines of the French Illuminati of the last century: "The liberties of the people are never so secure as when authority is firmly established." Here, authority, control, necessity, is seen to constitute the very basis of Civil Liberty. The utter incapacity of the French nation for Liberty consists in this essentially erroneous view of it, as mere self-control, self-determination, the absence of all objective necessity.[5] But we purpose to consider briefly, now, Dr. Williamson's notion of Freedom in its concrete manifestation.

1st. *As Religious, or Gospel Liberty.* The very essence of religion, considered subjectively, as first defined by Schleiermacher, adopted by Neander and many other German divines, but especially carried out and applied to Christianity by Morell, consists in *a feeling of dependence upon God.* Now, *de*pendence is the opposite of *in*dependence, or self-determination; for it presupposes authority, control. In so far as one man really depends on another, he is under the influence, the control of that other. But dependence here is only partial; while complete, absolute dependence is possible in no case, except that of man upon his Maker. In Christianity, therefore, this dependence is conceived as absolute. The question now is, How is this feeling of dependence — in other words, this consciousness of authority and control — at all consistent with Freedom? Is it not subserviency, bondage, slavery, fatalism? We recur to Dr. Williamson's illustration: The child depends upon, is controlled by the mother; yet the child feels perfectly free under this control. The two elements, control, Necessity *and* Freedom, are here completely *mediated*, harmonized and made identical, by a third element — LOVE. We shall now appreciate Morell's state-

[5] The above sentiments were penned during the month of January last. Subsequent events in Paris have afforded a most striking confirmation of the great importance and truth of the principles then advanced. It needs the strong hand of the first Napoleon to deal with such circumstances. He very well realized, what also Napoleon III realized, that France is not fitted for a republic; not even for a constituti na monarchy. Until Illuminism is completely rooted out from her soil, the Empire affords all the liberty France has the capacity to establish and maintain.

ment of the subjective essence of Christianity: "That form of religion in which we are *conscious* of absolute dependence and perfect (absolute) moral freedom, being harmonized by love." It will be seen, thus, that Dr. Williamson's notion of Freedom is precisely the same as that involved in the subjective essence of Christianity. It holds good in the highest possible form of its concrete manifestation as Religious Liberty. But briefly, again, in its concrete manifestation.

2d. *As Civil Liberty.* We have already alluded to the language attributed to the first Napoleon: "The liberties of the people are never so secure as when authority is firmly established." Precisely this, also, is Hegel's conception of *Rational Freedom*, the theory of which is most fully elaborated in his "Philosophy of History." We subjoin a few extracts; first, one from Hegel's translator:

"The aim and scope of that civilizing process which all hopeful thinkers recognize in history, is the attainment of Rational Freedom."[6] The union of Freedom and Necessity in the state is not: "As if the individual, in his relations to other individuals, thus limited his freedom, in order that this universal (mutual) limitation — the mutual constraint of all — might secure a small space of liberty for each (or the absence of control for each, — the notion of Blackstone and all the older jurists). Rather, we affirm, are Law, Morality, Government (control), and they alone, the positive reality and completion of Freedom. Freedom of a low and limited order is mere caprice" (or the freedom of savagism).[7] We must supplement the foregoing by the following from Dr. Hickok: "The sovereignty (self-control) of the individual is anarchy; and this is necessarily the absence of all liberty but the might of the strongest." "All true liberty, thus, must have law."[8]

These writers, contrary to the jurists and moralists of the older schools, distinctly recognize law, authority, control, as the very basis of Civil Liberty. Nothing further is needed,

[6] Hegel's Philos. Hist., Bohn's edit., p. vi.

[7] Ibid. p. 40.

[8] Hickok's Moral Science, pp. 156, 157.

then, by way of illustration of the truth of Dr. Williamson's notions of Freedom and Necessity, in their concrete manifestations as Religious and Civil Freedom. Freedom is essentially, in none of its concrete senses, the absence of Necessity, but the perfect mediation and reconciliation of these two elements, by means of Love; as, *e. g.*, in the family, love of the parent; in Christianity, the love of God, the Divine Parent; in the State, the "law and order" loving citizen, who has, politically speaking, become "a law unto himself." The contrary notion of Freedom, that of self-control, self-determination, is only the essential principle of anarchy, not of government; whether parental, divine or civil government. On the principle that authority, Necessity, is the very basis of Freedom, authority, whether divine, parental or civil, then governs by means of interest, reason, love. On the principle that Freedom is simply the absence of necessity or control, authority does not govern at all; it only puts limits, bounds, to self-government, or self-determination. Here is no possible logical solution of the problem of Freedom and Necessity, except only as it is a kind of compromise between Freedom and Necessity. This last was the theory of Montesquieu and the French publicists of the eighteenth century; of Blackstone and other English jurists; but it has long been abandoned by the best modern writers.

We must here present, concisely as possible, an inspection of the facts of consciousness touching these topics. Every man, then, *feels* free, and this *feeling* is a matter of his consciousness. Let the reader reflect a moment, and see if his consciousness of Freedom really involves anything more, really testifies to anything more, than this *feeling*. Is not this feeling the identical subject matter of consciousness, as it pertains to Freedom? The reader may ask: Does consciousness deceive me? can I possibly *feel* free, when I am not? By no means; it is this very *feeling* which constitutes Freedom. Freedom, in its essence, is emotional; and here we differ from psychologists generally, who make Freedom appertain to the volition or act. Here, too, we should differ

from Dr. Williamson's notion; or rather, as we conceive, define his notion more correctly and critically. Subjectively, Freedom is positive; it is this *feeling*. Objectively, it is negative; it is *un*consciousness of any restraint, or the absence of any feeling of restraint. This is, in more exact terms, we think, Dr. Williamson's idea of Liberty. The essence of slavery, of despotism, on our supposition, does not consist in control, for the loving child is controlled. The slave, the victim of tyranny, is controlled *against his interest and wishes.* Here, instead of the *absence*, we have the *presence* of a feeling of restraint, and this constitutes the slavery. Both Freedom and Slavery are purely emotional. They consist neither in control nor in its absence, so far as that is concerned, but in the nature and character of that control; whether it be consistent or not with the conceived interests and the wishes of the subjects. As regards the theory of self-determination, or of the absence of control, it is impossible for consciousness to testify positively to such a principle. How does one *know*, how can one be *conscious*, that there is not, in the *un*conscious depths of his being, something which controls his volition and act? All that, from the very nature of the case, consciousness can testify to positively, is simply this *feeling* of which we have spoken. What is alleged by self-determinationists, that man is conscious of abstract liberty, *because* he feels responsible for his acts, and attributes them to himself, is something with which consciousness, as such, has nothing to do. It is merely the theorist's logic which he attributes to consciousness — false logic at that.

The doctrine of motives should receive a passing notice here. The mind, in thought, in feeling, or in volition, is not mere *passivity;* the *tabula rasa* of Locke. It is a perfectly elastic power, or a pure activity. We shall borrow an illustration here, from Dr. Marsh, former President of the Vermont University, but long since dead. Take, then, an elastic ball; the reäction, rebound, on the occasion of impact, or concussion, is due wholly to the inherent elasticity; for a non-elastic ball would not thus rebound. Here, now, is not mere

passivity; for the *efficient cause* of the reaction is not the concussion, but the inherent elasticity; while the concussion itself is simply the condition, or *conditional cause*, of reaction. But this relation of efficient to the conditional cause is at once reversed, if we now speak of the *particular direction* in which the rebound proceeds. This *direction* depends, not on the inherent elasticity, except merely for its condition; but upon the direction or quarter *from* which the concussion came. Here, as to this direction in which the rebound takes place, all depends upon and is the exact resultant of the law of forces. The inherent elasticity is, then, the efficient cause of reaction as such, while the quarter from which the concussion came is the efficient cause of the *direction* of that reaction. These distinctions of efficient and conditional causes will help to explain the doctrine of motives. 1st. The mind as will, like the elasticity of the ball, is, in itself, essentially undetermined; that is, undetermined to any *particular direction*. It is in this ordinary and undetermined state of the will, that the mind *feels free;* or, in other words, not constrained to any particular act, such as *this*, or *that*. 2d. The mind as will, like the elasticity of the ball, is the *efficient cause* of volition as such. But 3d, Motive is the necessary antecedent, condition, or *conditional cause*, of volition as such. Thus far, there is nothing here inconsistent with the self-determination theory. The next step, however, carries us over into the doctrine of Necessity. 4th. Motive, though not the *efficient cause* of volition itself, *is the efficient cause* of the *particular direction* of volition, whether to *this* or *that* act; just as the quarter from which concussion comes determines, not the reaction itself, but its direction. Only, we may remark, with respect to this fourth statement, is there any *real difference* between the advocates of Self-determination and of Necessity, guided by the latest and best authorities touching this question. The advocates of Necessity maintain that the preponderating motive, in a given volition, determines, is the efficient cause of, the particular direction of that volition. Some writers on this side of the controversy may

hold, perhaps, that motive is the efficient cause of volition itself, as well as of the direction. But this is not at all necessary to their general theory. It would be necessary on the basis of Locke's *tabula rasa*, but not otherwise. The Self-determinationists, in our view, are perfectly correct in insisting, as they always do, that the mind, as will, is its own efficient cause of volition itself. If Dr. Williamson would deny this, we should say that such denial is not necessary to his theory, nor is it, we think, in accordance with fact. That motive is the efficient cause of volition itself, gives to the doctrine of Necessity a mechanical tendency, which, in point of strict logic, does not belong to that doctrine. But that motive is the conditional cause, the occasion of volition, in any given instance, is universally admitted by the leading advocates of abstract Liberty. To return, however, to our fourth thesis: That motive is the efficient cause, not of volition itself, but of its *particular direction;* this is, logically, the doctrine of Necessity; and here lies the pivot, so to speak, on which the whole controversy turns. The advocates of abstract liberty affirm that the will is not determined to this or that particular direction from without, from motive, but that it is self-determined; and our attention must be directed, for a moment, to this single point.

The will, or mind as will, is held to be self-determined. Our reply to this proposition is, that it is contrary to the very essence and definition of the will, as the *essentially in itself un*determined. If the will, as such, be determined, it is like the spring of a trap — capable of exerting its power only in a fixed, single direction. The will, then, in order to be capable of other than one fixed volition, must be essentially in itself undetermined, like the elasticity of the ball, before concussion takes place. Now the will, being in its nature and essence *un*determined, cannot also and at the same time be *self*-determined; for this is only to say in other words that it is *not* undetermined. The direction of any given volition is thus determined from without, or by motive. The will cannot be both, undetermined and self-determined in one. For this

would be to suppose a cause capable of producing the direct opposite of its own essential nature, as an effect of that cause. It is to give two contradictory definitions of will; first, as essentially undetermined; secondly, as essentially self-determined. Or we may state the contradiction in this way: self-determination, or volition in particular direction, is the effect; and this effect proceeds from its direct opposite, or the essentially undetermined, as its cause. But to conclude our remarks under this head, it is admitted on all hands that *motives themselves* are necessitated. If, then, these motives determine, or are the efficient cause of the direction of volition, this direction itself is also necessitated; and the doctrine of Necessity, so-called, is the final result. On this theory, God governs man, and men govern each other, by the power of motives; by considerations of interest, of truth and reason, of affection and love, considered as motives. Such government is consistent and identical with Freedom. To govern men contrary to their interest, contrary to truth and reason, contrary to their wishes, affections and loves, is simple slavery, despotism, and inconsistent with Freedom. God's government, as will be seen, is by the power of motives; not by physical nor mechanical power. Such is the doctrine of Necessity, critically viewed, and such are its bearings upon the subjects of divine or human government, upon Religious, Civil and Moral Freedom.

We come now to that portion of Dr. Williamson's work which treats of morality, human responsibility, and the nature and design of punishment. We very much doubt whether the chapters devoted to these topics have been so carefully studied, as yet, as to be fully appreciated. The author's views here are more important and valuable, and have a bearing upon the entire spirit of the Universalist theology, more direct, logical and significant than will be likely to appear on any cursory examination. The difficulty here is owing in part to the novelty and originality of the author's opinions. To be sure, so far as concerns the grounds of morality and of moral distinctions, the author's views do not

at their base, differ so much from the opinions of many other writers. Neither the selfish system of Bentham, nor the sentimental system of Smith, presents much analogy to Dr. Williamson's system. The so-called rational system of Cudworth; of Price, Stewart, and others of the Scottish school; of Cousin and others of the eclectic school; of Hegel, Rothe, etc., of Germany; of Hickok and most other native moralists; — this rational system of ethics is the only one consistent with that put forth in the "Rudiments." Its fundamental doctrine is, that the ideas of right and wrong, and so of ought, obligation, are *a priori*, or *necessary ideas*. They are intuitions of pure reason; and the system is hence termed the *rational system*. So far, then, as concerns the ideas of right, of wrong, of ought or obligation, they have nothing to do with the volitions of the will, whether necessitated or self-determined. The ideas themselves are necessitated; they are necessary ideas. It is only with respect, therefore, according to this system, to the grounds of human responsibility, with respect also to human merit and demerit, as applied to actions, that the question of Freedom and Necessity has any real bearing; and it is here alone, thus, that our author's theories possess peculiar interest for us at present. We turn, then, to what he has to say upon the nature and grounds of rewards and punishments.

Our author's opinions here will all be found to centre in, and to be based upon, the idea of the *essentially remedial nature of punishment* — a doctrine which Universalists generally will hardly feel at liberty to question. But if this doctrine of punishment is to be considered as settled and as denominational, we must be thoroughly consistent with it. Dr. Williamson seems to be the first Universalist writer who has clearly perceived and expressed, what alone is thorough consistency with this doctrine. There are two quite contradictory theories of punishment. If, in its nature, it be regarded as essentially and wholly remedial, this is Universalism. But if, in its nature, it be conceived as essentially and wholly vindictive, or as a mere satisfaction for sin and

guilt, this is Limitarianism. Our author holds to the former theory, and is thoroughly consistent with it, in his notions of human responsibility. If punishment, according to the strict etymology of the term, is essentially and wholly remedial; if it means, according to the old Sanscrit root, *pu*, *to purify;* it then relates exclusively to the future good of the subject, and not at all to his past misconduct; that is, the reason and ground of punishment is not as something due to past sin, in any sense whatever, except solely to prevent future sinning. The sinner is then punished, not because he *deserves* it, in satisfaction, or expiation, of his sin; but simply because he *needs* it, as a reformative motive and agent. The ground of punishment, thence, is not *blame*, *demerit*, in the sense of the older schools, but *need*, in the sense and entire spirit of Universalism. So, too, consistently with this principle, the ground of human responsibility is not this *blame*, *demerit*, but simply and exclusively this *need*, of the subject. Herein consists Dr. Williamson's whole theory of human responsibility and of punishment. Herein consists, also, his entire consistency with his own faith, as a believer in Universalism. It is, moreover, touching these very points, that his reviewer, in his objections to the doctrine of Necessity, is thoroughly inconsistent with his own theology. The pith of his entire philosophy on these topics is this: Man *deserves* punishment, for he is alone responsible for his sin; and he is alone responsible for his sin, for the sole reason that he is self-determined in his volition. The doctrine of Necessity takes away self-determination, hence responsibility for sin, and hence the demerit of sin, and finally the ground of punishment, which is that demerit. This, in few words, is the reviewer's philosophy on these topics, and the root of his objections to Dr. Williamson's theory of Necessity. It is in terms, in spirit, and in its logic, only the old theory of satisfaction for sin. It means this and nothing else. It means substitutional, or vicarious, atonement, and nothing else; for the atonement made by Christ, if anything, is something strictly rational and logical. But on the principle of satisfaction for sin

through punishment, the atonement cannot be rational and logical, except as it be substitutional or vicarious. For, 1st. An act once done is always done, and never can be undone. 2d. If that act be a sin it is always sin, and never can be aught but sin. 3d. If the agent be responsible alone for that sin, he is always responsible for it, and never can be otherwise than responsible for it. 4th. If he is to blame for that sin, he is always to blame for it, and never can be otherwise than to blame for it. 5th. That act cannot be taken away from him; that sin cannot be taken away from him; that responsibility cannot be taken away from him; and hence that blame, desert, demerit, cannot be taken away from him; he is guilty and must forever remain guilty, so long as that sinful act remains done, and not undone. Such is the simple, stern, terrible logic of the satisfaction theory. The act, the sin, the blame, or guilt, can never, on any rational, logical grounds, be taken away. Eternally is the agent guilty, and hence eternally does he *deserve* to be punished, as a satisfaction for that guilt. If the guilt could be taken away, the desert of punishment would then cease; but, logically, it is impossible to do it. Only by imputation and substitution can Christ take this sin, this guilt, this demerit, on himself; and only by imputation and substitution can the sinner take Christ's merits, Christ's righteousness, on himself, and thus be acceptable in the sight of an offended Justice, and finally saved by the abstract mercy of God. This is the philosophy of substitutional atonement. This is the logical result of the satisfaction theory. It is Limitarian theology, but it is not Universalism. It gives a certain explanation of, and receives some color of truth from, all such Scriptures as speak of Christ's suffering, the just for the unjust; as being made sin, while he knew no sin; as bearing our sins on the cross; etc., etc. But this explanation which it gives is not the correct one; and this color of truth is really a false color. The atonement is not a substitutional, vicarious sacrifice for sin. The true doctrine of the atonement finds its only logical basis in the doctrine of Necessity; and Dr. Williamson has struck

the key-note of it, and only the key-note; but it is a note grand and full of significance.

We must go, here, into the domain of history; and every fundamental inquiry respecting the theory of responsibility, whether the divine or human, conducts us ultimately into the domain of history. Is man, then, the only responsible agent in the world's history? Has God no responsibility here? Take the so-called world-historical acts — acts that were the turning-points in history, and that shaped whole periods; many of these acts were shameless crimes. So, also, take the world-historical individuals, whose acts have communicated to history its guiding impulses for centuries and ages; many of these individuals were shameless and debauched criminals. Did God have any responsibility in those acts? in the activity of those persons? If God necessitated, controlled those acts, he then had some responsibility in them. If he did not control them, then he had nothing to do in shaping and guiding those centuries and whole periods of the world's history which received their determination from those acts. In this case, there is no Providence in history; or, if there is, he is a mere spectator, an idle looker-on, who takes no share in the struggle, assumes no responsibility, yet, if any good is accomplished, receives all the glory! In this case, also, there is no divine plan in history; no universal, self-conscious Reason implicit in it; hence no philosophy of history is ever possible. A divine plan in history necessarily supposes a constant, universal concurrence and control of the individual acts of history, with reference to a preconceived end. There can be no such concurrence of these individual acts, unless they are controlled. It is almost trifling with serious and important subjects, to claim consistent belief in Providence, while denying the only possible ground on which a Providence can be conceived and predicated. This, in our opinion, is just what the self-determination theory does. It denies necessity to human action, claims for it entire self-control. It thereby excludes all, except this self-control, from the world-historical acts which determine the course of

MERCANTILE LIBRARY

history for centuries and ages after. If God would shape history, would exercise Providence in human affairs, he must do it *through* the individual human acts, which always determine, so far as the material cause is concerned, the direction, course and results of history. He cannot stand outside as a mere spectator, like the Primal Deity of the Oriental and Gnostic Philosophies, and still be a God of providence. He must share in the struggle, take a part in the tragedy, in the responsibility, in the glory (?). Yet not exactly this last. He must have *all the glory*, and therefore take *all the responsibility*, so far as the control of all human action makes him responsible!

There are, then, two elements in all human action, in all history — the divine and the human element. From the divine element proceeds the necessity or control of each act, and also the divine responsibility in and for it. From the human element proceeds the individual human responsibility, and to this element pertains the freedom of the individual actor. There are here two distinct motives, or intents, in every act of history; one is the divine intent, which gives law, plan, necessity, reason and philosophy, to history; the other is the human conscious intent, or motive, which regards the conceived aims, interests, the desires, passions, etc., etc., through which God prompts and controls the act. Here are two distinct conscious intents implicit, immanent in the selfsame acts of history. The problem, therefore, now regards the respective responsibilities of these two agents in the act; but *especially God's responsibility for the sinfulness of human action.* There centres in this problem, not only the question of human responsibility, but also by consequence of this, the question of the grounds of punishment, the question of blame, demerit, desert for sin, etc. The problem itself may thus seem one of great difficulty of solution. But its solution is quite easy, natural, and strictly logical, when contemplated from the proper, true stand-point.

What is the exact *ground* and *measure* of responsibility, whether divine or human, in action? It is simply and solely

the conscious intent, or motive, of the agent in the act. In jurisprudence, in ethics, in the ordinary judgments of men, the conscious motive or intent of the agent, in the act, is regarded the sole ground and measure of his responsibility for the act. If the motive be private, limited, selfish, evil, herein, and not in the act itself, consists the sinfulness of the act; even though, on the principles of ethics, the act in itself be good. On the other hand, if the motive be benevolent, rational, one with the universal design of God in human history, there attaches no sinful character to the act, no sinfulness to the agent; even though, judged by the absolute standard of morality, the act in itself be evil. The question of the divine and human responsibility, in the self-same act, now admits of a ready and strictly rational solution, God necessitates the act; he also necessitates the conscious intent on man's part, which governs, controls the act. If he did not necessitate the motive, neither could he control the act. But he inspires the motive, and by this controls the act. That motive, on man's part, may be private, selfish, irrational, and, in so far, attach to itself a sinful quality. But what is God's conscious intent in this? for it is alone this *conscious intent, on the divine side,* which *constitutes the ground and measure of the divine responsibility* in the act, and in the human motive that controlled the act. On the divine side, this conscious intent in the act, and in the human motive, was not private, selfish, irrational, such as it was on the human side; but it was unselfish, rational, one with universal reason, and one with the universal aim of history. On the divine side, therefore, there attaches not the slightest quality of sinfulness. Thus, the solution of the problem of responsibility in human acts here completes itself, so far as concerns the divine side. Though God necessitates the act, necessitates the motive that controls the act, he is in no sense responsible for the sinfulness of the act; for the sinfulness of the act alone consists in just that private, selfish, irrational human intent of the act, which *is not the divine intent* in it. The grand objection to the doctrine of Necessity, so frequently

urged, that it makes God responsible for the sinfulness of human action, here falls to the ground. This objection forgets, 1st. That God's conscious intent in human acts and motives, is the ground and measure of his responsibility in them. 2d. That the sinfulness of those acts consists alone in just that selfish, irrational, human intent, which *is not God's* intent, but is the *direct opposite* of God's intent. We repeat it; the solution of the problem of moral responsibility in human action, on the basis of the theory of Necessity, here fully and satisfactorily completes itself, so far as concerns the divine side. We have here a sure, and, withal, a perfectly safe basis, for a God in history; for a Providence in human affairs; for a philosophy of history; for none of which does the theory of self-determination afford any basis at all, such as may be deemed consistent and logical. There is here, too, a basis for practical religion. One may trust himself in a frail bark on a stormy sea, if he knows that the helmsman has control of the rudder, and thus shapes momentarily the vessel's course. But in the midst of life's stormy ocean, man cannot trust himself in the hands of God, believing that all shall work together for the good of the faithful, unless he knows, rationally and logically knows, that God controls events, controls human action, shapes the course of history, and of individual, human experience. Only such a conviction and knowledge, which the theory of self-determination virtually denies, can form an adequate basis for practical religion. Afflictions and bereavements are very frequent among men, and are often alone attributable, for their material cause, to the voluntary acts of the very persons afflicted and bereaved. What has philosophy, what has practical religion, to say to such persons, in their day of trouble? The minister must not be a hypocrite, in the house of mourning. Let him speak the truth, as he believes it, and nothing but the truth. The affliction which these persons suffer was the direct result of their own acts. The health of a child, for instance, was needlessly exposed, and the child sickened and died. The material cause was simply this act of needless

exposure of the child's health. There was no purpose, no control of God in that act, for it was self-determined. The parents have only themselves to hold responsible for their troubles. The act of needless exposure was exclusively their own act. God did not determine, did not in any way control it. There was, thus, no hand of God, but only their own hands, in their afflictions. This, on our present supposition, is the simple, unvarnished truth. But is this the true philosophy of human life and experience? Are these the principles on which practical religion grounds itself? If so, let us betake ourselves to the prayer of the last of the ancient philosophers, the noble Boetheus: "Look down on this miserable earth, whosoever thou art that holdest together the bonds of nature. We that are not the worst part of thy great work, are tossed about by every wind and wave of fortune. Mighty Ruler! *control these waves*, and make the earth firm with that law by which thou rulest the heavens." [9]

The solution of the problem of moral responsibility, on the principles already laid down, and as respects the human side of this problem, will easily complete itself, at least in harmony with the fundamental doctrines of the New Covenant, and of Christianity. Men must, in some way, be *saved from* their sins. The sin and guilt of the world must, by some method, be *taken away*. That sin and guilt must be hidden, covered up, blotted out, remembered no more. This is the language and spirit of the New Covenant, of Christianity. But all this must be done, not by any arbitrary, irrational method, but upon strictly rational and logical principles. It is not rational and logical to consider men innocent, guiltless, when, in point of fact, they are not; as the theory of substitution and imputation supposes. The act itself is done, and never can be undone. It cannot be hidden, covered up, nor blotted out. But the sinfulness of that act, and the responsibility for that act, on the human side, can be blotted out. Men must be declared judicially and logically innocent; and judicially, logically, they must be made such. God must rec-

[9] Maurice's Mediæval Philosophy, p. 18.

ognize them as such, and men must recognize themselves as such. Otherwise, there is really no salvation from sin and guilt, but merely a consent to consider them innocent, on some factitious, arbitrary principle. It must really, logically be made to appear that men are innocent; that they are saved; that their sin and guilt are blotted out, and remembered no more. This, indeed, *is* the identical stand-point of Christianity, properly speaking, and of the developed Christian consciousness. If there is any one thing that Christianity asks men to believe as fixed and certain, it is that they are saved; that their sin and guilt are taken away, are blotted out forever.[10] There certainly has been nothing arbitrary in this. On what logical principle, then, has this been done? Simply on the principle of God's conscious intent in human action. Cannot God afford to take upon himself this load of responsibility, of sin and guilt, which weighs down the heart of humanity? Is he not willing to do it? Is he not anxious to do it? Does he not plead with the sinner, to allow him to do it? That divinity forever incarnate in humanity, and in human history; that universal self-conscious reason, Logos, whose purpose, plan, conscious energy and intent, is implicit in all human action, and in the motives controlling it; that light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world; comes fully to himself only in Jesus of Nazareth. He is indeed the "King of kings," for in all ages his divine purpose, energy and conscious intent have been implicit in the actions of men, shaping thus, and only thus, the entire course of history. He, too, and in very deed, is our Great High Priest; for he came not to condemn the world for its sin and guilt, but to take that sin and guilt away; to take it on himself. He it is who is made sin, although he did not sin. He it is on whose head the sin and guilt of the world rests, while

[10] The principle here announced regards the object, or subject-matter of Christian faith. Does faith create its own object? or presuppose an object, as the truth or fact to be believed? Does belief save one? or is it not rather the very fact that he already is saved, which is to be believed? See, on this point, various Universalist writers. But if, from the Christian stand-point, men are already saved, how is it that they are still, on that very stand-point, to be regarded as guilty and deserving of punishment?

sinless and guiltless himself. He it is, too, who says: "I am Joseph your brother." "Be not therefore angry with yourselves that ye sold me hither, for God did send me before you to preserve life." It was God's conscious intent which was implicit in the act, and in the motive that prompted and determined the act. But that conscious intent was good; it was to save; it was one with the universal aim of history. It, therefore, was not sin. But as for yourselves, you were not conscious of that divinity which is implicit in all human action; of that divinity which shapes the course of history. You thus attributed the responsibility wholly to yourselves, and took the sinfulness and guilt of those motives wholly on your own hearts. It is only in the Christian consciousness, the God-consciousness, so-called, that man perceives himself but a temple of that incarnate Divine reason, which governs the world, and shapes the course of history. It is here, on the highest stage of Christian development, that the union of God with humanity completes itself; that the at-one-ment is made, and the sin of the world is taken away.

We trust the reader will pardon us, if in attempting a thorough analysis of the Biblical theory of moral responsibility, we have been obliged to touch occasionally upon those fundamental principles, which would seem to involve, also, a new Christology. But as Universalism has not, as yet, fully defined itself on this last subject, we cannot in these remarks be reasonably convicted of heterodoxy, as regards Universalism; much less, as regards sound Christian doctrine. We have, in point of fact, attempted only a logical appreciation and vindication of the doctrine, common to all Universalists, which respects the *essentially remedial nature of punishment.* From the higher stand-point of Christianity, which is, at the same time, to be viewed as the highest stand-point of all true philosophy, man does not *deserve* punishment, in the sense of the old theory of satisfaction; but he simply *needs* punishment, in the sense of the entire spirit of Universalism, and of a Divine Paternal Government of the world of humanity. The theory of moral responsibility, also, as viewed from the

same stand-point, must consistently base itself upon, or at least conform itself to, this doctrine of punishment, considered exclusively in the light of the etymological meaning of the term — an instrument of purification, or of salvation. Such, indeed, are the germs of Dr. Williamson's entire philosophy on these topics, so fully and so ably set forth, in those chapters of the "Rudiments" which treat upon these subjects. In the elaboration of his views here, our author only maintains thorough consistency with the spirit and distinctive doctrines of his own theology; a consistency which the review before us, in its principal objections to Dr. Williamson's treatise, seems almost wholly to lack.

So far as could reasonably be expected of a critic, whose own theory possessed many points of connection with that of his author, we have aimed to give an impartial and somewhat critical *resumé* of Dr. Williamson's "Rudiments." As regards the purely speculative views to which the investigations — often interrupted — of more than twenty years have conducted us, they differ fundamentally, in many points, from those which our author seems to have adopted; and we may say the same of the reviewer's philosophy, so far as his paper affords any hints by which to judge of it. With respect to the review itself, while its ability cannot be questioned, and while it serves to point out, in some particulars, wherein Dr. Williamson's theory might profitably be supplemented with views less mechanical, perhaps; its most frequent and most weighty objections to our author's treatise, have their ground in misstatements and misconstructions of the views of Necessitarians generally; as for instance, in the concluding portion of the review, now just received: "The only kind of government the doctrine of Divine Sovereignty, or Necessity, allows, is what we call mechanical or physical." Again, as respects the testimony of consciousness: "On the contrary, we are conscious of entire liberty in the whole domain of moral action. And what is worthy of observation, this is frankly confessed by the great majority of those who maintain or favor the doctrine of Necessity." What the reviewer means

by "entire liberty" here, is, of course, his own view of it; the theory of self-determination. That Necessitarians frankly confess that consciousness testifies to "entire liberty," in such a sense, is a statement, we regret to say, unsupported by a single respectable authority on that side of the controversy. Necessitarians never deny, of course, that consciousness testifies to freedom, in the sense which *they attach* to the term freedom; but this is not the sense which the reviewer means, in the above extract. There is in both the above extracts such a lack of critical and accurate statement, as would enable a reviewer to make out a case against his author, just as it pleased him best. If we have aimed at anything more than another, in this paper which we now conclude, it has been to win the confidence of the reader in the strict candor and impartiality of our constructions of other's views.

Article XIV.

Recent Explorations in Palestine.

The Recovery of Jerusalem: a Narrative of Exploration and Discovery in the City and the Holy Land. By Capt. Wilson, R. E., Capt. Warren, R. E., etc. With an Introduction by A. P. Stanley, D. D., Dean of Westminster. Edited by Walter Morrison, M. P., Honorary Treasurer to the Palestine Exploration Fund. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

In this utilitarian age science must always bow to use. Immediate practical results must furnish the occasion for calling in its aid. In the year 1864, Miss Burdett Coutts, moved by the sufferings of the people in the Holy City for want of wholesome water, appropriated a generous sum of money for securing a supply. This called out Capt. Wilson, of the Royal Engineers, who made a survey of Jerusalem and its vicinity, for the purpose of determining the best method of bringing water into the city — and this he did without salary, and even provided for his personal expenses besides.

The water of Jerusalem is most wretched, as all temperance travellers can painfully testify. It is caught in cisterns or open causeways during the rainy season, yea, some of it washes the pavement in the middle of the street before it is gathered in vessels for use. From April till November, during the warm, dry season, it remains in the pools and cisterns, often under ground, and before the rains come again stagnates and breeds vermin, and these, with the filth that settles at the bottom, render it utterly unfit for culinary purposes. The survey was attended with valuable results. The city has many subterranean aqueducts and cisterns which bring water from without and retain it for the use of the inhabitants, but the supposed springs under the Temple and Mosque on Mount Moriah, prove to be wanting. There are, however, wells or fountains, as Bir Eyub, or the Well of Joab, and En Rogel, or Fountain of the Virgin, and the Pool of Siloam, along the Valley of Jehoshaphat, which furnish water through the whole year. The water from these can be used, though it partakes somewhat of the qualities of surface water, and it is brought into the city in skins, the ancient "bottles," on the backs of donkeys, and sold at a good price, which affords quite a little revenue to the owners. The city is thus partially supplied. So the question of water supply is one of philanthropy. The subsidiary results of this survey, also, as throwing light upon the site of the Temple and the antiquity of the city walls, the aqueducts and the reservoirs, have not been unimportant.

This enterprise having been so successfully completed, the way was opened for a survey of the whole land. It was commenced in Beyrout, in November, 1865, and prosecuted by means of astronomical instruments, the use of the base-line and triangular measurements. The site of important locations has been fixed, mistakes in distances have been corrected, the latitude and longitude of mountain peaks and cities been accurately determined as the foundations of future calculations, the ridges and the water-sheds between the Jordan and the Mediterranean marked, the ancient roads traced,

and the dimensions of lakes and rivers ascertained. By this means many statements made in the Bible have been verified, disputed points settled, and inconsistencies removed.

The Land of Gennesaret and all the region around the Sea of Galilee, so interesting to all Christians as the scene of important events in the life of Jesus, have been investigated, the sites of cities determined, and the customs of the ancient inhabitants revealed to us. The old system of irrigation by means of reservoirs and aqueducts by which the whole plain of Gennesaret was watered and rendered fertile, is graphically described in Capt. Wilson's report of "the Sea of Galilee." He makes it nearly certain that Tell Hum, "the Mound of Hum," situated on the northwestern shore of the Sea, two miles from the mouth of the Jordan, is the site of the ancient Capernaum, "the Village of Na-hum," the place whither Jesus fled from Nazareth, when driven away by his offended neighbors, and the scene of several of his miracles. Here he found many ruins, and among them the "White Synagogue" and a large building adjoining, formed of the ruins of the Synagogue and situated near the water's edge. The description of this Synagogue is so interesting that we cannot refrain from copying it:

"The Synagogue, built entirely of white limestone, must once have been a conspicuous object, standing out from the dark basaltic background; it is now nearly level with the surface, and its capitals and columns have been for the most part carried away or turned into lime. The original building is seventy-four and three-fourths feet long and fifty-six and three-fourths feet wide; it is built north and south, and at the southern end has three entrances. In the interior we found many of the pedestals of the columns in their original positions, and several capitals of the Corinthian order buried in the rubbish; there were also blocks of stones which had evidently rested on the columns and supported wooden rafters. . . . It may be asked what reason there is for believing the original building to have been a Jewish Synagogue, and not a temple or church. Seen alone, there might have been some doubt as to its character, but compared with the number of ruins of the same character which have lately

been brought to notice in Galilee, there can be none. Two of these buildings have inscriptions in Hebrew over their main entrances; one in connection with the seven-branched candlestick, the other with figures of the paschal lamb, and all without exception are constructed after a fixed plan which is totally different from that of any church, temple or mosque in Palestine. . . . If Tell Hum be Capernaum, this is without a doubt the Synagogue built by the Roman centurion [whose servant Jesus healed, as mentioned in Luke vii. 4–10], and one of the most sacred places on earth. It was in this building that our Lord gave the well-known discourse in John vi. 24–59, and it was not without a certain strange feeling that, on turning over a large block, we found the pot of manna engraved on its face and remembered the words, 'I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead." [1]

What an interesting link in the chain which connects us with the age of Christ! This is the identical building just unearthed in which Jesus gave that discourse concerning the bread of God. It is specially interesting to us as a denomination as being the place where Jesus uttered those memorable words which embody the cardinal truth of Universalism: "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father's will who hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." [John vi. 37–9.]

Eight more synagogues have been discovered along the shores of Galilee and on the plain of Gennesaret. One of these was found among the ruins of Kerazah, two and a half miles north of Tell Hum, which Wilson thinks is the site of the New Testament Chorazin. Dr. Robinson argued that the site of Capernaum is at Kahn Minyeh, one mile and a half farther south, down the Lake from Tell Hum, which is, doubtless, the Galilean Bethsaida, if Wilson and Thompson are right in regard to Capernaum; while the great Fountain,

[1] The Recovery of Jerusalem, pp. 268–9.

Et Tabigah, near, is the same which is called Capharnaum by Josephus,[2] and represented as watering the plain of Gennesaret as confirmed by Wilson's researches. Magdala, modern Mejdel, is still further south, three miles from Tiberias, now a mass of ruins, once the home of that Mary whose sin and subsequent repentance and sincere reformation have introduced a new and tender name into the language of all Christian nations.

Capt. Wilson has also rendered it probable that "the country of the Gergesenes" [Matt. viii. 28] where the two demoniacs were cured and the swine "ran violently down a steep place into the sea," is the modern Khersa, half-way between Wady Fik and Wady Semakh, on the south-eastern shore of the Sea where the hills come within forty feet of the water's edge, while in all other places on the eastern shore they recede from half to three-fourths of a mile.

Little new was discovered at Nazareth, but the jug-shaped cisterns found at Dothan, a site identified by Dr. Robinson, render the story of Joseph's being sold by his brethren at least credible. The valley of Shechem, and the mounts Ebal and Gerizim on the north and south of the city, were carefully examined and two natural amphitheatres marked on the opposite slopes of the two mounts as the probable scene of the assemblage of the Israelites when the blessings and cursings of the Law were pronounced [Josh. viii. 32–35; Deut. xxvii. 11]. "Nothing is wanting in the natural beauty of the site to add to the solemnity and impressiveness of such a scene" [p. 363]. The ruins of the church which Justinian built on Gerizim were excavated, the original plan determined, and foundations brought to light which are supposed to be the walls of the old Samaritan Temple. Jacob's Well was entered by Anderson, who reports it dry, but formerly containing water, as evidenced by a pitcher lying unbroken on the stones that have been hurled down by tourists. Maundrell reports it one hundred and five feet deep, but now it is only seventy-five, and seven feet and a half across.

[2] Jewish War, III. x. 8.

In this Survey the situation of more than sixty places was accurately determined, many heights measured, and the physical character of the country described; and the map which is to be the result of the Survey will, doubtless, be more perfect than any previously made.

The Palestine Exploration Society went into operation in 1865. After the preliminary surveys by Wilson and Anderson, Capt. Warren, with four assistants from England, went to Jerusalem in February, 1867, and engaged in the work of excavating for the purpose of ascertaining the foundations of the old city and finding relics that would throw light upon the sites of remarkable buildings and the customs of the people. A firman was procured from the Sultan at Constantinople permitting him to dig anywhere within and around the city except in the Sacred Enclosure, and requiring Turkish officials to render him all requisite aid in their power. Instead of doing this, they threw many obstacles in the way, from the Governor down through all his subordinates; and the exception made by the Sultan prevented him from making investigations into the site of the old Temple as he desired. Quarterly statements have been made by Capt. Warren, and tourists have from time to time visited the works and published accounts of the progress made. The operations were carried on with various interruptions for more than three years, when in May, 1870, ill health and want of funds compelled Capt. Warren to give up the work. This is regarded, however, only as temporary. In due time the work will be resumed and pushed on, doubtless, with new vigor.

The book before us — "The Recovery of Jerusalem," so called from the watchword adopted by the Crusaders in the twelfth century when on their way to wrench the Holy City from the grasp of Moslem power — embraces the results of these explorations so far achieved. After a graphic Introduction by Dean Stanley, author of "Sinai and Palestine," summing up the labors of the Society's agents, more than half of the book is taken up by Capt. Warren's plain but

graphic narrative and descriptive account of his operations in and around the city. Besides these, it contains Wilson's description of the Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem in 1864, and Palestine in 1865, "the Architectural Remains of Palestine," by R. P. Spiers, the Hauran, a country east of the Jordan and the Sea of Galilee, by Count de Vogué, Pottery and Glass Vessels, by Rev. G. J. Chester, the Moabite Stone, and the Explorations in search of the true route of the Israelites in their forty years' Journey through the Peninsula of Sinai, by Rev. F. W. Holland.

The work is necessarily fragmentary and the results meagre. Many will be disappointed that so little has been done to settle disputed questions in regard to the topography of the city. The writer of this article certainly was, on reading the volume, as his hopes were greatly encouraged on visiting the city, conversing with Capt. Warren and examining the scene of his operations eighteen months after they were commenced. But when we consider the great difficulties and expense of the undertaking, the persistent jealousy of the Turks, the obstacles thrown in the way by the officials, their frequent attempts to stop the work altogether, the small amount of funds raised, the unhealthiness of the climate, and the inherent dangers of the work, we should be grateful that so much has been accomplished. The personal narrative of Capt. Warren, detailing the difficulties and dangers encountered, the obstacles met with, and the means and devices used to prosecute the work, is exceedingly interesting. The work was prosecuted by native Arabs, chiefly, of the village of Siloam on the western slope of the Mount of Olives, many of whom dwell in tombs and are not the most amiable of the human race, under the care of the five Englishmen, occasionally aided by Rev. Dr. Barclay and Dr. Chaplin, missionary clergyman and physician, stationed at Jerusalem. The special objects sought were to ascertain the location of Mounts Moriah, Akra and Zion, the site of the Temple and Solomon's Palace on Moriah, the Tombs of the Kings, the direction of the Walls, the Tyropœon Valley, and test the validity of the

monkish traditions in regard to the scene of our Saviour's crucifixion and burial, and the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, on Mount Akra. Light has been thrown on some of these subjects, but certainty in regard to most of them has not yet been reached. Shafts were sunk in various parts of the city, and horizontal channels or galleries were excavated hundreds of feet into important localities. The materials of the different strata dug through were so loose that it was necessary to insert mining cases or curbs made of strong pieces of plank mortised together. The dangers are detailed as follows:

"The work was one of considerable danger, for we were frequently subject to being blown up by the loose shingles which in an instant would destroy our galleries; to being smashed by the large pieces of masonry which lay huddled together above us, loosely lying one above the other, and ready to collapse at the slightest movement beneath them; or else to having our skulls stove in by the stones and iron bars which the fallahîn, in their anxiety to be smart, occasionally allowed to fall back upon us from the mouth of the shafts" [p. 42].

After all the precautions that were taken, stones sometimes fell down upon the heads of the workmen, wounds were inflicted, and masses of earth falling suddenly nearly buried up the men at work down the shafts. The air in some places became impure so that it would not support the flame of a candle. One of our party went into some of the shafts in November, 1868, and breathed the mephitic gases to the serious detriment of his health. Men were obliged to crawl into passages hardly large enough to admit their bodies, and again pass through subterranean channels nearly up to their chins in water. Once Capt. Warren dropped down into a newly-discovered perpendicular shaft many feet under ground, and was so wedged in that the workmen were obliged to extricate him by hard pulling with ropes, with the loss of much of his clothing and his skin. Lieut. Anderson fainted on being let down into Jacob's Well, but recovered before he was drawn

up, so that he was able to complete the examination at the bottom.

When the officers of the city refused to aid as the Sultan required, it was necessary to appeal to the Pacha or Governor, and sometimes he too was obstinate, and then an appeal must be made to the Sultan. The owners of the land came in with their exorbitant demands for damages, which must be settled by compromise or arbitration. The interference of the superiors demoralized the workmen, and they fled and the work was abandoned for a while. The Governor would not allow the party to dig less than sixteen feet from the Temple or city walls, as fears were expressed of their being undermined. In order to reach the wall, Capt. Warren was obliged to begin his shaft at that distance and then gradually approach the walls several feet under ground, in certain places where it was necessary for him to examine them.

During the warm months, fevers and other kinds of sickness attacked the parties, and at times caused the total suspension of the work. Want of regularity in transmitting the funds seriously interfered with it, as the Arabs would not work unless they were promptly paid. Lumber in Jerusalem is very scarce. There are no saw-mills to manufacture it, and the planks to make the curbs were brought from abroad at great expense.

Let us now examine some of the results gained. The City of Jerusalem in its situation and surroundings is unlike any other. It is built upon a rock jutting out south into a basin a mile wide, and composed of three prominences or hills. On three sides it is bounded by deep ravines — Jehoshaphat on the east, Gihon on the west, and Hinnom on the south, the last six hundred feet below the spot where the ravine begins to dip down, at the north-western corner of the city. The three hills — Zion on the south-west, Akra on the north-west, and Moriah on the south-east — once had precipitous sides with deep indentations or gorges between them, but now these gorges have been filled up somewhat by scrapings from the summits of the hills and ruins of the stone edifices over-

turned and destroyed during its seventeen captures. These ruins served as foundations for houses subsequently erected, which again in their turn have become the foundations of later structures. The Valley of Tyropœon, or the Cheese-mongers, for instance, between Zion and Moriah, is from fifty to eighty feet higher than when Abraham visited it, and the present bed of the Brook Kedron is forty feet higher, and one hundred feet farther east, than the former bed. Araunah's threshing-floor, on Mount Moriah, was formed on the surface of an oval rock. Walls were built at the base of this rock, and earth and boulders filled in so that with the exception of an elevated platform on which the Mosque of Omar Hassan stands, and slight depressions in some places, the Haram esh Sherif, or Sacred Enclosure, is tolerably level. The features of the city have thus been essentially changed since Josephus gave his description of it so often quoted.[3] He speaks of the city as built on two hills, and the intervening valleys so deep and the slopes so steep that they were impassable. The walls of the city were then more extended on the south, and perhaps on the north, than now, including within them the Pool of Siloam. The direction of the old triple walls has not yet been determined. The walls now standing were erected, according to an Arabic inscription over the Jaffa Gate, and other records, by order of Sultan Suleimân, A. D. 1542.[4] A vast amount of excavations must be made in order to ascertain the lines of the ancient walls. Yet much depends upon this. The present Church of the Holy Sepulchre stands upon the spot where Christ was crucified and where he was entombed, if we may rely upon monkish traditions which have been handed down from generation to generation for fifteen hundred years. Yet as executions of malefactors and burials of the dead were not allowed within the city, it must be proved that the site of the present church lies without the lines of the ancient walls, or the traditions must be given up and in that case we never shall know where this greatest

[3] History of the Jewish War, V. iv. 1, 2.

[4] Robinson's Biblical Researches, Vol. I., p. 261.

event in the world's history occurred. The gist of the evidence afforded by Warren so far is hostile to the prevailing view.

An important inquiry attempted to be answered by the explorations is that in relation to the site of the Temples of Solomon, Zerubbabel and Herod. They occupied, probably, nearly the same spot. If we accept the account of Josephus, we shall not dispute their being on Mount Moriah. But did the original Temple stand over the Sacred Stone on the site of the Mosque of Omar? The Haram is a hill some sixteen hundred feet on the eastern side, whose wall is coincident with that of the city, facing the Valley of the Kedron and the Mount of Olives, one thousand feet on the north, facing Bezetha, nine hundred and thirty feet on the south, whose wall for about half the distance is coincident with the city wall, facing Ophel, which is really only a continuation of Mount Moriah. The wall has been built up above the original surface of the soil from fifty to one hundred and sixty feet on the south and east sides, and from eighty to one hundred and fifty feet on the west side, through the Valley of Tyropœon, and the intervening space leveled up with stones and gravel. Warren's excavations have revealed the great height of the southern and eastern walls. The Mosque is situated about half-way from the northern to the southern wall, nearer the western than the eastern, on an oblong paved platform raised sixteen feet above the surrounding enclosure. The Sukhrah, or Sacred Stone, of irregular shape, rough, from fifty to sixty feet across, lies directly under the great dome of the Mosque, some five or six feet above the floor, and surrounded by an iron fence. It seems, at first thought, natural to place the Temple here, but some locate it at the south-eastern angle; some, extending across the whole southern end; and others, across the northern end; and others, still, would have it cover the whole enclosure. Josephus says it was about six hundred feet square, so it could not have included the whole area, or extended across either end. The discovery of a depression which may be called a valley, extending just north

of the Mosque and across the north-eastern corner of the Area, towards the Golden Gate, is fatal to the theory of Williams that the Temple extended across the northern part, as we cannot suppose the Jews would have erected it on low ground when a hill rises directly behind it.

Capt. Warren seems to think that the present state of the excavations points to the Mosque as being situated nearly on the site of the Temple. He would place it three hundred feet north of the south-east angle of the wall, and thence extend it six hundred feet north, thence nine hundred feet across the whole Area from east to west, making the building oblong instead of square, as Josephus describes it, so that the eastern wall would have been coincident with the wall of the city, overlooking the Valley of the Kedron, which descended some two hundred feet below it. This would leave a vacant space six hundred feet long and three hundred feet wide in the south-eastern part, where he locates Solomon's Palace, and directly underneath, his stables facing the Kedron on the east. Excavations have revealed the arches of these stables, one hundred feet north of the south-eastern angle. Another vacant space three hundred feet square is left on the south-west, forming a park fronting the Temple, from which a bridge was extended across the Valley to the Xistus, which was supposed to be a long colonnade running north and south on the eastern brow of Mount Zion. In 1838, Dr. Robinson, on the occasion of his first visit to Jerusalem, discovered the portion of an arch projecting from the Haram walls on the west, and he conjectured that it was the abutment of a bridge that spanned the Tyropœon. Capt. Warren, by sinking seven shafts at different points across the Valley, discovered the broken arches and piers, and thus confirmed Robinson's view. The great antiquity of the city, and the changes that have taken place during successive ages, have thus been strikingly verified. Descending to the bottom of the shafts, and returning, we find the following changes to have occurred at successive steps:

1. A winding aqueduct cut into the rock, twelve feet deep.

2. The west Haram wall was built, and above this Solomon's Temple and Palace, and a bridge thrown across the Tyropœon Valley.

3. The arch of this bridge fell, and two stones belonging to it were found having broken through the aqueduct arch.

4. The second arch was built, the Temple reconstructed by Herod, twenty-three feet of rubbish accumulated over the aqueduct, on which a pavement was laid and shafts were run down to the canal for water.

5. The second arch fell, and now rests upon the pavement.

6. Rubbish again accumulated over the fallen arch, twenty feet deep.

7. The second pavement was laid upon this rubbish and houses built above it, when Wilson's Arch was erected three hundred feet north of Robinson's Arch.

8. These houses fell, and the ruins fill up the Valley forty-five feet above the first pavement. The bridge when standing was one hundred and seven feet above the rock aqueduct, and thirty-three feet above the springing of the Arch.

Thus the Valley has been filled up with *débris* and rubbish, in some places to the height of eighty-four feet, and the houses now rest so high above the primitive soil. By digging through these strata we learn the successive stages in the history of the different races and generations that have dwelt here, as we learn the history of the earth's crust by examining the successive geological strata. The discovery of Robinson's Arch was fortunate, as it has "served in a great measure to simplify the discussions with regard to the position of the Temple." The bridge across the Valley was undoubtedly the one on which Titus held the parley with the Jews after he seized the Temple, but before he had succeeded in getting possession of the whole city.

What is called Wilson's Arch—so named from Capt. Wilson of the Ordnance Survey, was really discovered by Dr. Barclay, an American missionary, who conjectured that it was the broad aisle through which the tribes of Israel went up to the holy Temple—consists of a succession of arches and

vaults, extending west from the Haram wall. The main arch is one hundred and twenty feet above the bottom of the Valley, and from this another bridge extended across the Tyropœon. There is a tunnel eighty feet above the surface of the rock which has been traced two hundred and fifty feet westward, and was probably the secret passage-way from the Temple to the king's palace. This passage-way was nearly opposite the south wall of the Temple, if we concede Dr. Robinson's and Capt. Warren's view of its site to be correct, in front of the Gate of the Chain and near the Jews' Wailing Place. The vaults underneath display considerable architectural finish and elegance. They may have been used for storage rooms and cisterns. Masonic Hall, as it has been called, is decorated with ornamental pilasters and capitals, and the walls are constructed of beveled stones, indicating great antiquity. "This chamber has every appearance of being the oldest piece of masonry in Jerusalem, with the exception of the Sanctuary Walls, and perhaps as old as they" [p. 68].

In the south and east wall are enormous beveled stones, some of them measuring from twenty to thirty feet long, five to seven feet wide, and three to four feet thick, weighing one hundred tons or more. Phœnician characters are found upon them, which connects them with the workmen from Tyre and Sidon in the age of Solomon, as surely as the discovery of the sculptured pot of manna at Tell Hum connects the synagogue there with the Jews. These stones must have been placed there by Solomon when he built the Temple, or before. They could not have been removed at the destruction of the Temple by Titus, A. D. 70. They mark the boundary line of the old city and the Temple Area. The stones, too, in the walls of the Mosque of El Aksa, on the southern walls of the Haram, which Dr. Robinson thought to be the church of Justinian, built in the sixth century, are very large and probably once did service in the Temple building.

Warren's excavations tend to confirm the view of Dr. Rob-

inson that the Tyropœon Valley extended from the Jaffa Gate east between Akra and Zion to Wilson's Arch, thence south between Zion and Moriah to the Kedron below the Pool of Siloam; but they disprove the common opinion that the Fountain of the Virgin, on the southern slope of Ophel, is supplied from a natural spring underneath the Mosque of Omar. "No trace could be found of any drains connecting the Bir el Arwah beneath the cave with the Fountains of the Virgin and Siloam." A shaft was sunk east of Birket Israil, a large quadrangular trench, one hundred and seventy-five by three hundred and sixty feet, near St. Stephen's Gate, in the north-western angle of the Haram Enclosure, seventy-five feet deep, with a mass of rubbish at the bottom, which is popularly supposed to be the Pool of Bethesda, and he was surprised to find here an abundant supply of water, which flowed off somewhere into the Valley of the Kedron. Why may we not suppose that this is the source whence the Fountains of the Virgin and Siloam are supplied? If so, we shall have the three Fountains all supplied from one source, or at least connected together; and Warren thinks that the Pool of Siloam and the Well of Joab are connected, though the passage has been only partially traced. If so, the four, in and above the Valley of the Kedron, are all connected, so that water flows under ground from the highest to the lowest. Dr. Robinson held the opinion that the Fountain of the Virgin is the true Bethesda, and assigns the fact of the intermittent rise and fall of the water as serving to explain the troubling by the angel [John v. 4].

Warren argues that the Valley of Hinnom is identical with Jehoshaphat, and consequently extends along east of Jerusalem, instead of south of it, as generally believed. The two valleys unite below the south-eastern angle of the city wall, near the Well of Joab, and the name Ge-Hinnom, or Valley of Hinnom, might have been given to the lower end of both. Here Tophet was located, where sacrifices were offered to the god Moloch, children were cast into the fire, and other horrid rites engaged in. Warren's view seems to be confirmed by

1 Kings xi. 7: "Then did Solomon build an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before (*i. e.* in front or east of) Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon." Compare this with Jer. xix. 2: "Go forth into the Valley of the son of Hinnom which is by the entry of the *east* gate." Vast quantities of offal and rubbish, according to most writers on the subject, were brought from the city and dumped down this Valley: and for this purpose the steep declivity west and south of Mount Zion would seem better fitted. Dr. Robinson, on the authority of Rosenmuller, denies the existence of other fires here than those of Baal and Moloch. In this he arrays himself against nearly all other writers who, because vermin were bred in the offal and fires were kindled to consume it, have assumed that our Saviour drew from this circumstance the figure of temporal punishment for individuals and nations "where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." Mark ix. 44–8. The writer of this article actually saw the fires burning refuse matter near the Jaffa Gate, one evening, a few months since, when coming up the Valley. Near this Gate, Capt. Warren on one occasion wished to make some examination of an aqueduct, when the filth was so great that he was obliged to give up the attempt. The awful rites of Baal and Moloch were long ago banished, but the accumulations of filth remain and the fires have not yet been extinguished, and the old stigma still clings to the spot. Unpleasant are our associations connected with it.

Capt. Warren's excavations have established the fact that the aqueduct through which the water is still brought as of old from the three Pools of Solomon, three miles south of Bethlehem and nine from Jerusalem, enters the city near the Cœnaculum and Jaffa Gate, and runs along the supposed Valley of the Tyropœon through the passages connected with Wilson's Arch and underneath the Dome of the Rock where are vast cisterns to receive it. This water does not benefit the Jews and Christians of the city, as it is allowed to be used only by the Mussulmans of the Mosque and the houses

adjoining. The fact of these cisterns being filled with water led many tourists, doubtless, to conjecture that living fountains existed there and supplied the Pools of the Virgin or Bethesda and Siloam. The excavations have brought to light many other sources of water supply, and shown that a good portion of Jerusalem is honeycombed by cisterns and aqueducts. But no natural fountains exist there, unless we make exceptions in the case of Birket Israil and the Tyropœon, and in these instances the evidence is not certain.

Few relics have been found during these explorations. Some vessels of Phœnician, Greek, Roman, Christian and Arabic pottery, and glass, jars, vases and lamps, balls of flint and other stone, limestone Sarcophagi containing human bones (one discovered by the American Consul near the Convent of the Cross), "the Seal of Haggai," a black stone Jewish relic, and the celebrated Moabite Stone which has excited so much interest in the Christian world. Most of these relics have been sent to England.

The explorations must go on. It would be a shame and a disgrace to the Christians of the West to allow them to cease utterly. The course of the old city walls must be traced, the identity of the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre with Mount Calvary be tested, if possible, the form of the ancient Jewish houses ascertained, and the domestic and social customs of the former inhabitants learned, and sites of interest fixed, the despotic and jealous policy of the Turkish rulers overturned, and the Haram Area thrown open, like Pompeii, to our inspection. For this purpose funds are needed. Let not Americans be backward in contributing to this noble object. We have done something, but not enough. Let local and national jealousy be dismissed, and the movement which has recently been started in New York fall in with the operations of the Palestine Exploration Association, and then shall the history of old Jerusalem be re-written, and its long-covered splendors be exposed to the gaze of the present age.

ARTICLE XV.

History of the Devil.

Geschichte des Teufels, Gustav Roskoff.

Histoire du Diable, ses Origines, Sa Grandeur, et sa Décadence, par Albert Reville, Revue de Deux Mondes, Tome LXXXV.

AMONG the "discrownéd kings" whom Time, rather than revolutionary violence, has brought slowly down from their ancient thrones, there are few whose *prestige* has been so imposing and so extended as that of Satan, King of the Infernal Regions. In speaking of him, we may truly say a "discrowned king," for those of our contemporaries who still profess to believe in his existence, and in his power, live absolutely as though they did not believe in it; and when faith and life no longer interpenetrate each other, it is only fair to say that the former is dead. At the same time, so great and lasting have been the effects of this popular belief in the existence of the devil, it has seemed of interest to bring together, and to describe in their logical genesis, all the transformations and developments it has undergone. The occasion is offered us by a recent and remarkable work which we owe to a Professor of Theology in Vienna. The book of Prof. Roskoff is almost an encyclopedia of all which bears upon this subject, and the author will pardon us if we borrow freely from his opulent rendition. May the University of Vienna, rejuvenated at last by the events which have changed the face of Austria, pay up its long arrears to all the world of letters, by the production of many works like this.

The first traces of this belief in the existence of the devil are distinctly marked, though very simple, and date to the remotest antiquity of which we have any knowledge. The human creature finds himself surrounded by natural phenomena, touching him at every point; some, friendly to him, and as such beloved by him; others, adverse, and consequently dreaded. Instinctively, he personifies them, and his universe is at once peopled with good and evil divinities. As a general

rule, and in virtue of that *näive* selfishness which characterizes children, and nations in their childhood, the gods who are dreaded receive more worship than those who are beloved. Hence the most prominent divinities of savage nations are objects of hideous form; gods of savages, they are distinctly savage gods. Coming down to a pastoral and agricultural period, we find the worship of the evil-dealing powers no longer so exclusive. Upon the whole, the great powers are beneficent, but here we encounter a legion of malignant beings of a second rank; this is a characteristic of all the inferior religions, and so strong a hold have they upon the popular imagination that they outlast the religions to which they belong, and linger for ages clinging about forms of faith of a far higher spiritual level.

In the great mythological systems, as those of India, Egypt and Greece, the seeming dualism of nature is reflected in the distinction made between the gods of order and production and those of disorder and destruction, and the general principle that order at last triumphs inspires such myths as that of Indra vanquishing the storm-cloud, or Orus, the avenger of his father Osiris, wickedly put to death by Typhon. This two-fold character in objects of worship is extremely conspicuous in the Greek mythology, but with this peculiarity, that each divinity has in himself the two-fold aspect of benefactor and bringer of evil. For example: Phœbus Apollo is the god of light, civilizer, inspirer of the arts, purifier of the soil and of human hearts; on the other hand, he sends pestilences, he is pitiless in his revenge, and there is danger even in his friendship. The same is true of his sister, Diana, or rather Luna, who is at one time represented under the charming aspect of a virgin, beautiful and chaste; at another, with the sinister traits of Hecate. This mingled character of good and ill is common to all the Hellenic pantheon, and is carried through without interruption from the supreme pair, Jupiter and Héré, to the rulers below, Pluto and the fair Proserpine, *she who strangles.*

The Latin mythology suggests the same reflections, and

where its characteristics are peculiar, it is even more dualistic than the polytheism of the Greeks. The Sclavic mythology has its black and its white god. The Gallic, the German and the Scandinavian divinities unite to their amiable and beneficent traits others which make them objects of dread; and at the present day, the elves and sprites, the wood-nymphs and water-nymphs, which yet linger in the popular belief, are endowed with the same mixed characteristics. These last lingerers of the divine army of old are at the same time gracious, attractive and generous when they please; and, also, vindictive, capricious and dangerous.

In investigating the origin of the devil, all these facts have place, for we shall see that he is a complex being and many of his essential traits render him akin to the sombre elements of all the religions which have gone before Christianity. A more careful consideration is due to one of these earlier religions — that of the Zend-Avesta, the Persian faith; since here, in the most gravely moral polytheism of the elder world, we find a religious conception very nearly allied to that which Semitic monotheism has bequeathed to us under the name of the Devil or Satan.

The Zend-Avesta exhibits the divine hierarchy as an organized dualism, applying both to the physical and the moral world. Gods of light and gods of darkness divide all time and space. The Zend religion, in its original development, recognizes two powers alike eternal, whose battle-ground is equally the terrestrial globe and the heart of man. Everywhere Ormuzd plants good, Ahriman sows evil. The history of the fall of man, due to the perfidy of Ahriman, who took the figure of a serpent, offers a remarkable parallel to the same history as given in Genesis; and it has been often maintained that the Biblical story is borrowed from the Persian. This opinion seems, however, unfounded, since in the Iranian narrative it is the genius of evil who appears in the disguise of a serpent, while in the Hebrew it is the real serpent speaking, acting, and, in the end, drawing down punishment upon himself and his descendants. The latter must therefore be

considered the more ancient, since the idea of a superior being disguised as an animal which talks and reasons, denotes a reflection unknown to the primitive mythology. It is true the Jews at a later period discovered their Satan under the guise of this scriptural serpent, but this was evidently an after-thought, doing violence to the sacred text. It is then more just to regard the two myths, Hebrew and Persian, as two variations of different antiquity upon one primitive theme whose origin perhaps goes back to the time when the Semitic and the Iranian people were still one family, living in the shadow of Ararat.

The resemblance, however, between Satan and Ahriman becomes very close,—a circumstance which appears entirely natural when we remember that the Persians were the only Polytheistic nation with whom the Jews, emancipated by them from Chaldean servitude, entered into close and enduring friendship. Satan is not an Hebraic version of Ahriman, but it cannot be denied that he owes much to his Persian *confrere;* from the time that he makes his acquaintance he imitates him; he adopts his manners, his morals, his tactics; he establishes his infernal court upon the same pattern; in a word, he transforms himself into the likeness of the other. Ahriman has his legions of evil angels whose business it is to tempt and destroy the human race. Not merely physical ills, but moral offences, occur through their agency. The virtuous man is the soldier of Ormuzd, fighting under his command against the powers of darkness; the wicked is the servant, and becomes the instrument, of Ahriman. The Zend doctrine teaches that Ahriman shall finally be conquered, and himself converted to goodness. In this respect he is favorably distinguished from his Jewish-Christian brother; but one may question how far this formed part of the primitive notion of Ahriman, and up to this point the parallel is almost perfect.

We will now examine the history of the Jewish Satan as found in the Old Testament; and here we may notice first, that he is mentioned only in three books, and those among

the least ancient of the sacred canon — Job, Zachariah and Chronicles. At a very early period, however, the Israelites shared in the polytheism of the neighboring Semitic nations; and as this worship was driven out by the worship of Jehovah, they did not cease to regard the heathen deities, whom they renounced, as actually existing personages. Baal and Moloch, cruel, wicked, hostile to the Jewish nation, were to the mind of the monotheistic Jew, now very much like the devils of a later day. Nothing conceivable, however, is more hostile to any dualism in worship than Jehovism, strictly taught. The Hebrew Jehovah has, and can have, no rival. He holds in his own hand all power, moral and physical. Nothing happens, nothing can be done on earth, save by his will, and more than one Hebrew writer attributes to him, without the slightest reserve, the suggestion of evil or mistaken acts, which later would have been ascribed to Satan. Jehovah hardens whom he will harden, destroys whom he will destroy, and no man has the right to call him to account. But as he is also regarded as supremely just, it is conceded that if he hardens the heart of the wicked, it is that they may dig their own grave; and if he distributes good and evil at will, it is in the forms of rewards to the righteous and punishments to the wicked. It was impossible to remain always satisfied with this theory, convenient, but disproved by experience; but it lasted long, and makes clear to us the nature of those religious ideas which later gave rise to a conception of Satan.

The Hebrew monotheism did not exclude a belief in celestial spirits, *sons of God* (*bené Elohim*), angels, like a divine soldiery surrounding the eternal throne. Submissive to its orders, executing its commands, they were in some sense functionaries of the divine government. The direct application of the chastisements or of the favors of God devolved upon them. Consequently some of them in the discharge of their duty were objects of dread rather than confidence. For instance, it was a spirit sent from God who troubled Saul. An angel of the Lord appeared to Balaam, sword in hand, as

if to transfix him; and an angel of the Lord destroyed in one night the Assyrian host. One may even identify an angel who seems to be the personification of a guilty conscience; namely, he who in the celestial court is the accuser of men. Without doubt, sovereign justice decides alone, and in the plenitude of its sovereignty; but it is after contradictory debate. Now he whose profession is to prosecute the offender, before the divine tribunal, is an angel whose name, Satan, implies *the adversary* in the judicial as well as in the ordinary sense of this word. This is the Satan of the book of Job, still a member of the celestial court, appearing among the sons of God, but having for his special office to continually accuse men, and who at last becomes so suspicious in his character of public accuser, that he believes in the virtue of no one, ascribing all pious actions, as in the case of Job, to interested motives. The deterioration in the character of this angel is already commenced, and the story shows that when he will try the endurance of a righteous man to the very end, he spares nothing. It is likewise as an accuser of Israel that Satan appears in the vision of Zachariah (iii. 1). Thus characterized, and it being admitted that angels may and do interpose in human affairs, it follows that Satan has no need to borrow from Ahriman, to become dreaded by the Israelites as the worst enemy of mankind. From this moment his malevolence is suspected in all public and private disasters, and the fatal suggestings which the earlier Jehovism ascribed directly to Jehovah, are now charged at once upon Satan. In the history of King David is found a curious example of this development of religious opinion. The king one day formed the unfortunate design, impious even, in the eyes of the prophets of that day, of numbering the people. Upon this matter the second book of Samuel (xxiv. 1) says that the Lord, being angry against Israel, "moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah"; on the other hand, in the first book of Chronicles (xxi. 1) the case is stated thus: "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel."

Nothing shows better than a comparison of these two passages the change which had taken place in the interval between these two writings. From this time forth the monotheist refers to *the Adversary* those evil suggestions and those calamities which he had formerly ascribed directly to the Lord. It is also presumable that this theory afforded relief to certain difficulties which must have embarrassed the mind of the religious of those days; for as man advances, he ceases to be content with the crude and child-like conceptions of a Divine Being which amply sufficed to less reflecting ages.

In this conception of the Adversary, the ill-disposed angel, Satan, we find the original idea of the devil of Jewish and Christian faith. It will not do to identify him unceremoniously with the more or less immoral divinities of the polytheistic religions. That his points of resemblance to them become stronger every year, we must frankly confess; but he is of different origin, and even though the Jews had never come in contact with the Persians, we should have received from Jewish tradition a Satan, armed *cap-a-pie*. Satan is neither son nor brother to Ahriman, although the time comes when their resemblance is such that they may be easily confounded with each other. In fact, the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, which are distinguished from the canonical by the Persian and Alexandrian elements contained in them, we find Satan immensely increased in importance and *prestige*. The Septuagint translating his name by the word *Diabolos*, whence comes our word *Devil*, defines exactly his primitive character of *the Accuser;* but henceforth he is something much more than that. He is the arch-conspirator and instigator of evil. We have him represented as a lofty personage, reckoned among the angels of the highest rank, and who, ambitious of rising yet higher, is banished from heaven with his accomplices. Now he unites the hatred of God with his former hatred of men. Here commences his imitation of Ahriman. Like the Persian divinity, he is at the head of an army of evil beings who execute his orders. Many of these are known by name, as Asmodeus, who plays a conspicuous

part in the book of Tobias, and whose Persian origin cannot be doubted. Following upon his new importance, and his entire separation from the faithful angels, Satan has now his separate kingdom, and his residence in the lower regions. Like Ahriman, he desires to spoil the work of creation, and to destroy the innocent happiness of mankind. From this time it is agreed that it was he who, in the guise of a serpent, tempted Eve. Hence it is he who introduced death and its attendant horrors; and he dreads chiefly those of the human race who by their superior sanctity are able to defend their fellows against his insidious attacks. A host of disorders, strange in character and mostly incurable, madness, epilepsy, dumbness, blindness, and the like, are ascribed to his agents. Thousands of demons who act under his direction are constantly escaping from the air-holes of hell and — like the demons of night known to the earlier religions — they seek lonesome regions and deserts for their abode; here, however, they are weary and thirsty; they rage hither and thither, finding no rest, and presently they go to find shelter in a human body, consuming its substance, and refreshing themselves with its blood. Sometimes even several effect a lodgment in the same body. These are the demoniacs, or possessed with devils, of the Gospel narrative. At the same time this mythology of the Jews dares not carry out to the utmost the Persian idea. Satan is never represented as offering a direct attack to Jehovah, and indeed he may be driven away, and his myrmidons, by certain formulas, in which appeal is made to the Most High. His power is limited strictly by the divine will. The dualism is then very incomplete. On the other hand, the Satan of Jewish faith will never be turned to good. Forever prince of evil, knowing himself condemned by the Divine decree to a final and hopeless defeat, he will persist forever in his ill-doing, and become the executioner of Divine vengeance upon those whom he has ensnared by his terrible wiles.

Such was the aspect of the Jewish faith on this point, at the period when the Gospel was for the first time preached.

The development of the Messianic ideas among the Jews had much to do with this other popular belief. The devil, daring not to offer attack to Jehovah, nor to angels of high estate, contents himself with resisting the servants of the Almighty who dwell upon the earth. Now the Messiah is preëminently the servant of Jehovah. He comes to restore the Divine Kingdom upon the earth where until now the power of demons has so greatly prevailed. The devil will defend his possessions to the last extremity, and the work of the Messiah may involve a personal encounter with "the prince of this world." This must be borne well in mind, in reading the Gospels. Satan and the Messiah personify, each on his own side, the power of evil and of good, giving battle to the death, at every point where they can encounter each other, nor would Jesus have been regarded as the Messiah by any of his nation had he not been found stronger than the demons in all cases where they brought to him those who were possessed.

The question has greatly engaged modern theologians who themselves have not much belief in the devil, whether Jesus really shared the popular opinion of the day and of his nation on this subject. Without attempting to decide the point, let us merely call attention to the fact that the principles of his religion were not favorable to opinions of this sort. Nowhere does he make a belief in the existence of Satan one of the conditions of entering into the kingdom of God; and if we agree that Satan is but an idea, a symbol, it affects in no way those conditions as stated in the Gospels. Purity of heart, a thirst after righteousness, love towards God and man, — all these are completely independent of the existence or non-existence of Satan. Thus we observe that, speaking in an abstract and general manner, without modification by circumstances of time or place, Jesus invariably eliminates Satan completely from his field of instruction. He declares that our evil thoughts arise out of the heart; but according to the theory of a satanic existence, they are due to the devil. Sometimes it is evident that he uses popular opinions as a

form, an image, to which he attribuutes no practical reality; he makes a parable; he calls one of his disciples, for the moment, "Satan," a tempter to do that which must not be done. A similar reflection occurs to us in studying Saint Paul's epistles, who evidently believed in the existence of Satan, and yet in his mind moral evil is due to the human nature of mankind, not to any exterior and personal influence of a Tempter. In a word, the teaching of Christ and of Paul, though it nowhere combats this popular belief, can do without it, and tends constantly to lose it from sight. At this day there is many an excellent Christian who has no fear at all of the Prince of Darkness; but at that time, this was one of those germs, so numerous in Holy Scripture, which could develop only in a different intellectual atmosphere. All that precedes it shows us how it happens that there is so much more about Satan in the New Testament than in the Old; a belief in the existence of the devil and the hope of the Messiah's coming grew side by side. Let us, however, observe that if the New Testament speaks often of Satan, of his angels, of the devil "seeking whom he may devour, it is more than discreet in its description of them. A certain marked reserve hovers over the entire subject; the devils are invisible; there is attributed to them no palpable form, and a crowd of superstitions which came in later with the idea that they could be objects appreciable to the senses, were as yet unknown. However, with the Christian era, we may consider the character of Satan as completed. He marks the point where the real polytheistic dualism and the limited dualism which alone was possible to the Jewish monotheism meet and touch. He will gain still further importance and will assume new forms, but such as he is now, he will remain. This is he, the ancient Satanas, object of terror to our fathers, in whom unite all falsehood, impurity, malice — in a word, the very ideal of evil.

The first ages of Christianity, far from developing that side of the Gospel which tended logically to consign the devil to the shadowy region of impersonality, on the contrary widely

increased his domain, multiplying his interferences in human affairs. He served as a scapegoat for the horror felt by the early Christians for the institutions of Paganism. At first the Christian Church was very apt to confound the Roman Empire with the empire of Satan. This, however, was not of long duration, and next we find the early Christian Apologists ascribing in set terms to the devil all the traits, good and bad, presented by the polytheistic religions which environed them. All that was noble and good they considered to have been artfully intermingled by the Arch-Enemy with the fatal errors that he desired to promulgate, in order more effectually to ensnare those who might have rejected unmingled error. The school of Alexandria alone showed itself more reasonable, but had little influence on the majority of the Christian believers. Then especially the idea was spread abroad that Satan was in a sense a rival, ridiculous indeed, but for a long time powerful, of the only true and living God. Having a thirst for honors and dominion, he had imitated, as best he could, the Divine perfections; and though he had succeeded but in making an odious caricature, yet, such as it was, it had long blinded the nations. Tertullian, on that subject, utters one of his brilliant epigrammatic sentences: "Satan," he says, "is the ape of God." Thus the Greek and Roman divinities became in the mind of Christians as well as Jews, demons, who had usurped divine rank. The license of pagan manners, too often consecrated by the rites of religion, gave a sort of popular justification to this view, shown as they were in strong relief against the pure morals which made an essential feature of the Christian faith. Satan was thus more than ever "the Prince of this world."

Still another circumstance tended to extend this faith in inferior powers of evil. Polytheism, in its decline, yielded to its internal logic, becoming more and more dualistic. Its later developments, distinguished as platonism and pythagorism, are all saturated with dualism, and thus open a large career for the imagination to create every species of evil genii. At this period, asceticism, which consists in slowly

killing the body under pretext of thereby developing the soul, was not peculiar to the Christian Church; it existed wherever a morality founded upon religion was practiced. The visions of the fasting devotee, heathen or Christian, gave to the imaginary beings who visited him all the air of reality. In the words of M. Roskoff, the doctrine of angels and demons gave to polytheism on the one hand, and to Jewish and Christian monotheism on the other, a sort of neutral ground upon which they could meet. The religious movements known under the name of Gnostic sects, which represented with varying proportions a *mélange* of pagan, Jewish and Christian views, had for their common characteristic a faith in the existence of fallen spirits, tyrants of men and rivals of God. The great successes of Manichæism, that union of Persian dualism and Christianity, are due to the popular leaning towards this idea of a systematic strife between the genius of evil and the spirit of good. The Talmud and the Kabala show the effect of the same influence. One must not, then, charge upon the Christian religion the great importance attached at that time to Satan; it was a wide-spread tendency, and it would be more correct, perhaps, to say that Christianity, like all the contemporary religions, fell under its influence.

The Messiah of the Jews was now become for Christendom the Saviour of guilty man; and here the radical antagonism of Satan and the Messiah takes on a new aspect. It resolves itself, from the end of the second century, into a grand drama, wherein the Christ and the Devil are the principal actors. The multitude delighted in the idea that the Christ descended into hell, and in virtue of the right of the strongest, snatched away from Satan the souls which he held captive. Shortly, however, this idea received modifications. Irenæus taught that men, since the fall, were by right the property of Satan; that it would have been unjust in God to deprive him of what was thus his right; but that Christ, in character of a sinless man thus independent of the devil, offered himself as a substitute to the Prince of Darkness, and

the bargain was struck. It shortly became apparent that the devil had made a poor calculation, since in the end the Messiah was not to remain in his power. Origen makes himself the organ of a singular class of views in which it is admitted, without repugnance, that in the work of redemption Christ and the devil encountered each other in strategy, the latter believing that he should retain in his power a prey which he valued more highly than all the human race, the Saviour knowing well that he should not remain in the power of the devil. This notion, which amounts to making Satan the deceived and Christ the deceiver, scandalous as we now regard it, was extremely well received, and long predominated in the church. One can see that this way of regarding the redemption was not calculated to diminish the *prestige* of the Adversary in the minds of men. Nothing augments the fear of the enemy like extravagant descriptions of his power, and the dangers one runs from his attacks, all the more as, by a singular contradiction from which the ancient theology never could get free, the same devil, conquered, felled to the ground, reduced to helplessness by the victorious Christ, continued none the less to exercise his power over the vast majority of the human race. The saints alone were safe from his wiles, and according to the legend which now began to spread in every direction,—how much prudence and energy had it cost even them to escape the danger! The trace of these views is found in everything. Baptism was an exorcism. To become a Christian was to renounce the devil and his works. To be expelled from the church for immorality or heterodoxy, was "to be delivered over to Satan." At this time the doctrine of the fall of the evil angels developed itself. Sometimes the date of this fall was made to depend upon the verse in Genesis where the sons of God are said to have taken wives of the daughters of men; this, however, not accounting for the presence of Satan in Paradise, the time was set back to the moment of the creation of the world. St. Augustine was of opinion that through the fall their bodies, formerly subtle and invisible, became gross. From that

time, we come upon visible apparitions of the devil. Councils, from the fourth century, enjoin it upon bishops to watch carefully those of their diocesans who practice magic arts, invented by the devil, and there is much said of vicious women who imagine that they are to range the fields by night in the train of heathen goddesses, Diana among the others. But as yet these "sabbaths" are purely imaginary, dreams suggested by Satan to those who give themselves up to him by their evil inclinations.

Soon, however, this all became real and material. There was no saint who had not at least once beheld the devil appearing in human form; Saint Martin even had met him disguised to resemble Christ himself. Usually, however, as the angel of darkness, he appeared as a man, all black, and it was in this guise that he was wont to escape from the heathen temples and idols overthrown by the zeal of the neophytes. Finally the idea that one can make an agreement with the devil to procure what one most desires, giving one's soul in exchange, arose in the sixth century, with the legend of St. Theophilus. This saint, in a moment of wounded pride, made over to Satan his soul by a paper formally drawn up and signed; of which shortly after repenting, he obtained from the Virgin Mary that she would get back from the Prince of Darkness the fatal document. This legend, composed with the design of spreading the worship of Mary, added greatly in the end to the renown of a very different personage.

At this time, also, the devil saw his reputation enormously enhanced when barbarian hordes by thousands were introduced into the church, all as ignorant as it is possible to imagine, and completely saturated with polytheism. They brought with them their divinities of field and flood, and the church, almost as ignorant and superstitious as its converts, changed these mythic creatures into demons and attached them to the retinue of the great adversary of souls. But long after, and without its being considered a renunciation of the Catholic faith, there were offerings presented, either from

fear or from gratitude, to these spirits, in many parts of England, France and Germany. Gradually the belief in the infernal powers lost whatever of dignity it had in the earlier times, and became exceedingly gross and stupid. At the beginning of the mediæval period they began to regard certain animals — the cat, the toad, the rat, the mouse, the black dog, the wolf — as serving for symbols, auxiliaries, and even temporary visible form to the devil and his legions. These were the animals regarded as particularly sacred to the ancient divinities whom the church changed into devils, and also the human sacrifices in some cases offered to these divinities gave rise to the idea that Satan and his train were greedy after human flesh. The were-wolf, who devoured children, was successively a god, a devil, and a sorcerer, going to the witches' sabbath, and thus disguised to avoid recognition. We all know a sorcerer must have his cat. Thus about this time the corporeal form of the devil was gradually fixed upon, very nearly that of the ancient satyr, a horned forehead, pendulous lips, a furry coat, a tail, the cloven foot of the goat, or the hoof of the horse. One might accumulate semi-burlesque or semi-tragic details, but it is preferable to mark the salient points of development of this belief.

At the point we have now reached, we meet it in a new aspect. With the Jews just before the Christian era, Satan was become the adversary, distinctly, of the Messiah; with the first Christians, also, the direct antagonist of the Saviour of mankind; but in the middle age, Christ is in heaven, far away and above all antagonism: the living present organism, destined to realize his kingdom upon earth, is the church. Henceforth it is the church and the devil between whom lies the quarrel. The "sabbaths" which ancient councils voted purely imaginary, are now something perfectly real. The Germanic idea of *fealty* introduced into the church, and characterizing the Christian's relation to Christ, is travestied in the kingdom of darkness, and the sorcerer is regarded as governed by the same fidelity to his master the devil. As

vassals come to render homage to their suzerain, so the liegemen of the Adversary gather to pay him like honor, sometimes, on fixed anniversaries, — at other times, called together by special convocation. There is a suggestion of the Celtic and German myth of the Wild Huntsman in these mad flights through the air of witches and sorcerers on their way to the nocturnal rendezvous. A similar travesty is noticeable in the ceremonies of these occasions where the mass said backward is the principal feature. In her course towards these offenders, the church was most severe. She classed together the Jew, the excommunicated person, the heretic and the sorcerer; and if we recall with what docility the state allowed itself to be persuaded by the church that its first duty was to exterminate the heretic, we shall not be surprised at the rigor of the penal laws uttered against the imaginary crime of the sorcerer.

This, the main point in the belief in the devil of the Middle Ages, must be closely examined; those who believe yet in some sense in the existence of Satan, can hardly realize what it then involved. It was the fixed idea of the world from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century — a period which may be marked as the apogee of this superstition. A fixed idea tends to subordinate everything to itself. Examine, for instance, the Spiritualism of our day, and one is surprised to see how the most indifferent and insignificant events are made to assume importance. An imperfectly-closed door which opens of itself, an insect which describes arabesques in its flight, the cracking of a board in the floor, — trifles like these are sufficient to send the Spiritualist far out of sight in regions of conjecture. If now we generalize from this, substituting for these harmless illusions a faith in the continual intervention of the devil, we shall be able to form some idea of the state of feeling at the time of which we speak. As an illustration, we will cite from the Revelations of the Abbé Rickaume, a work to-day entirely fallen into oblivion, but which was of great fame in the thirteenth century. The Abbé believed himself to possess a particular gift of discern-

ment in relation to Satan and his satellites, who, according to him, attack with particular vehemence church men and good Christians. What did he not suffer, this poor Abbé, from these imps of darkness! From the distractions which molested his soul during mass, to the nausea which troubled his digestion, from the discords of the choir to the attacks of coughing which interrupted his sermons, — all the annoyances of his life were the work of evil spirits. "For example," he says to the novice who is his interlocutor, "when I sit down to religious reading, the devils cause me to become sleepy. Then I am accustomed to put my hands out of my sleeves that they may become cold; at this, a devil stings me under my coat, like a flea, and so draws my hand to the spot that it becomes warm, and my reading once more careless." They love to make men repulsive in appearance. Noting a man who will keep his lips decently closed, they render the lower lip pendulous. "See," he says, "observe this lip; for twenty years a little devil has hung on to it to drag it down." He continues after the same fashion, and his novice demanding anxiously if there are many demons who make war upon man, the Abbé replies that each of us is surrounded as much by devils as a man plunged in the sea is by water. Happily the sign of the cross can usually defeat their malice, but not always; for they know well the human heart, and can avail themselves of its weakness. One day the Abbé, having set his monks at work building a wall, heard distinctly a young devil, hidden among the stones, cry out, "What painful labor!" only saying it to inspire the monks with a desire to complain. To the sign of the cross it is often useful to add the effect of salt and of holy water. The devils cannot endure salt. "When I am at table, and the devil takes away my appetite, as soon as I have tasted a little salt my appetite returns; it disappears again, I take more salt, and again am hungry." In the hundred and thirty chapters which comprise these Revelations, the Abbé does scarcely any other thing than to bring under this fixed idea the most trivial circumstances of his daily life; but the popularity which the

book enjoyed, appearing after his death, proves that he was in exact accord with the spirit of his time. And the literature of that day abounds with similar instances.

Now this perpetual preöccupation with the idea of the devil had a two-fold result; on the one side comic, on the other sombre. By dint of seeing and hearing of Satan on every hand, men became familiar with him, and by a sort of involuntary protest of the mind against such imaginary horrors, they grew bold and began to feel quite at ease with his horned Majesty. The legends show him so miserably deceived by the sagacity of the saints and the good priests, that his reputation for astuteness gives way entirely. One comes even to speculate on the foolishness of the devil, deceiving him as architects of bridges and of cathedrals, in the old legends, are reported to have done; and in the religious dramas of that time he is mercilessly handled and buffeted with ridicule. But, none the less, in those ages, men were atrociously afraid of the devil. In the theatrical representations, sanctioned by the church, they had him at an advantage; but he made grievous amends in the terror that he inspired in their daily lives. Immense was the number of persons suspected of commerce with him. It was the first idea which came into one's head who sought to explain an enemy's success, or the triumph of some audacious project. De Marigny, the Templars, Jeanne Darc, many other illustrious victims of political hatred, were convicted of sorcery.

At this time appeared the idea of a pact concluded with the devil signed by the sorcerer with his own blood, in token that body and soul henceforth belonged to his infernal ally. Also at this time was resuscitated the old Italian superstition of bringing destruction upon any one, by mutilating or piercing a little wax figure of the person made with certain magic arts. And now councils were busy with this supposed widespread evil, and Pope John XXII., accused himself of sorcery, sets forth in a bull of the year 1317 the bitter grief that is caused him by the dealings with the devil of which his own physicians and courtiers have been guilty. From the thir-

teenth century onwards, the crime of sorcery was followed up with the heaviest penalties, and popular superstition was only too ready to supply victims. At Toulouse, in 1275, the first sorceress was burned at the stake. At Carcassone, in one hundred and thirty years, more than four hundred executions took place for the crime of sorcery. These sanguinary horrors had only a local character at first, but in the year 1484 an act of Pope Innocent VIII. extended over all Christendom this terrible procedure. Then commenced throughout all Catholic Europe that shocking hunt after sorcerers which marks the paroxysm of the belief in the devil; which concentrates and condenses it, during more than three centuries; and which, yielding at last under the reprobation of the modern conscience of humanity, shall finally carry off with it from the earth the belief of which it was the offspring.

The famous bull *Summis desiderantes* of Pope Innocent gives into the hands of the officers of the Inquisition the pursuit of sorcerers as well as heretics, and shortly after, the *Malleus Maleficorum* of Henri Institoris and Jacob Sprenger, a book sanctioned by the Pope and the Emperor, was issued as a sort of commentary upon this bull. The work became the recognized code of procedure against sorcerers of every description, explaining their nature, their actions, and the methods by which they might be circumvented. Especially noteworthy is the detail of judicial proceedings in the case of the supposed sorcerer, marked by the most cruel disregard of humanity and justice. From this time history is red with the horrors of these procedures, where the victims were drawn from all ranks in society, from both sexes, and from all ages, down to children not yet ten years of age! The pen drops from one's hand in narrating such atrocities. Gradually the paroxysm abated. The seventeenth century witnessed a marked diminution in the number accused, and especially the number convicted of sorcery, and the latter part of the eighteenth century affords, in Spain and in Switzerland, the last two instances of this fatal madness.

A weapon has been made against Christianity of these san-

guinary horrors, due, it is said, in the final analysis, to a belief which Christianity has propagated among nations until then ignorant of it. Nothing can be more superficial and historically inexact than this view. The old dualistic idea, anterior to Christianity by many ages, is alone responsible. Pagan antiquity had its necromancers, its magicians, its *stryges*, none the less dreaded than the sorcerers of Christian times. We have seen that dualism inheres in all natural religions; that in their fullest development these religions tend to an eminently dualistic conception of the forces which rule the natural and spiritual world; that the Satan of Jewish faith owes, though not his personal existence, yet his growth and his demoralization, to his contact with the Persian Ahriman; that the devil of later days has borrowed largely from his pagan neighbors. In reality he is at once Jewish, pagan and Christian. Christian, because his proper domain is moral evil, the physical harm which he does arising only from his passionate desire to corrupt human souls, and these latter yielding to him only with guilty intentions. Jewish, inasmuch as his power, great as it may be, can never go beyond the limits fixed by the Almighty. Finally, pagan, since he is the inheritor of so many traits from the polytheistic beliefs. We may regard a belief in devils coming down to us from the mediæval period, as the retaliation of paganism upon Christianity; or, if you prefer, as a residuum from the old polytheisms, perpetuating itself in new forms.

That which prolonged the reign of Satan and his demons was not alone the authority of the church, but that state of mind which is betrayed in all so-called scientific study of date anterior to Bacon and Descartes. The real knowledge of nature did not exist, the sentiment of the inviolability of her laws had yet to be born. Alchemy, astrology, medicine, ran straight into magic; they all believed, with the theology of the day, in occult forces, in talismans, in the power of spells, in impossible transmutations; even later, how mystical and superstitious are the physiological doctrines of Cardan, of Paracelsus, of van Helmont! It is clear that the general

condition of intelligence, determined greatly by the church, I acknowledge, but by the church herself undergoing the influence of the reigning ideas of the time, was truly the cause of this long train of follies and abominations which constitute the history of the devil in the Middle Ages and the modern period. The proof is this, that in a time and in countries where the church was yet powerful and determined, a belief in the devil has been seen to fall, to waste away, to draw back out of sight, to become ridiculous, while no persecution has signalized this grave change in the ideas of enlightened Europe. The legends tell that the most tumultuous "sabbaths" vanished like a puff of smoke, at the rising of the sun; in truth, the legends were right to an extent of which the framers never dreamed.

The two great facts which, acting upon the general condition of the human mind, brought about this change, were the indirect influence of the Reformation, and the progress of rational science. True the reformers did not combat this belief in the devil. Luther, on the contrary, held it earnestly. Calvin, owing to his stern and unimaginative character of mind, was able to remain sober while speaking on a theme which turned the steadiest heads, but he shared the common opinions regarding the power of Satan, and enunciated them many times. It is only of an indirect influence that we speak. It was that grand doctrine of the sovereignty of God, so dear to the early Protestants, which brought them to feel that Satan was but an instrument of the Divine Will, and gave them strength to despise the rebel angel, feeling that he was utterly powerless towards the elect. Likewise, the simpler forms of worship, and the negation of any supernatural power residing in the clergy, went far to dissipate this nightmare of the ignorant. No more exorcisms, neither at baptisms nor in supposed cases of demoniacal possession; no more stage effects where the priest, armed with the holy water brush, attacked the devil and drove him away in person. If here and there there was talk of one possessed with an evil spirit, prayer and exhortation were the sole measures

adopted for his relief, and soon the cases died out. The idea that the miracles related in the Bible are the only true ones, led people to live without expecting miraculous interferences in their daily lives, and the miracles of the devil's performing soon vanished totally. Satan returned again to what he was in the first century — a spirit, invisible, impalpable, tempting to evil, whose solicitations must be repelled, from whom a moral regeneration sets man securely and forever free. In the drama of redemption he has lost all place. It is between the believer and his God alone. In a word, without dreaming of denying the existence and the power of Satan, using his name freely in popular exhortation, the reformation slowly drives him out of the sphere of practical life, reducing him, in point of fact, to a personification of moral ill. Romanism in France, at its noblest period, the seventeenth century, influenced no doubt by the Reformation, presents a similar aspect. With what sobriety the most illustrious of the French clergy, Bossuet, Fenelon, and even Bourdalone, treat this part of the Catholic faith!

The honor of having given a decisive blow to the superstition of the devil rests, however, with a Dutch pastor, Balthazar Bakker, who takes the field not merely in the name of good sense and humanity, but also of theology, and publishes, in 1691, his famous work entitled, "The Enchanted World." Four thousand copies went off in two months; it was translated into all the languages of Europe, and the heated controversies to which it gave rise show clearly that it marks an epoch in history. It is true modern criticism would find much to alter in the views of the Dutch theologian, but all must agree in the aphorisms with which he sums up his book: "There is no sorcery save where men believe in it; refuse to believe in it, and it ceases to exist. Free yourselves from these foolish and antiquated superstitions, and exercise yourselves in the practice of piety." The author was degraded by the Synod, and shortly after died. But they could not kill his book. It lived and throve, and from that time we may regard the devil's cause as lost in scientific the-

ology. The progress of the human mind in the knowledge of nature and modern philosophy have done the rest.

The spirit of scientific research, dating from the time of Bacon and Descartes, no longer suffers those hasty conclusions which characterize the ages when imagination predominated and where the promptness of men to decide on difficult points was in exact ratio to their ignorance. The inductive method gives as much solid ground to what it does establish, as it inspires doubt in regard to all matters which lie outside its field of investigation. There are, no doubt, necessary verities which we cannot test in this crucible, but they are so connected with our life, our nature, our conscience, that we must believe them. Now, if one could say that a belief in the devil recommends itself by its high moral utility, if it improves the character, if it makes a man more pure, more brave, more devout, we should have good reason for wishing to save it from the attacks of modern reason; but, on the contrary, the reverse is true. Faith in the devil tends to weaken the sentiment of individual responsibility. If I do wrong, not because I am a wicked man, but because I am impelled thereto by a being of great force outside my own will, my guilt is without doubt diminished, if not removed utterly. We have just seen the deplorable superstitions, the harmful follies, the horrible crimes, which this belief has long inspired. That which is proved against sorcery, it may be said, is not proved against a personal genius of evil, threatening and tempting men on every hand. But the two stand or fall together. If there be a devil, a being of superhuman powers, striving to destroy mankind, body and soul, for his own private satisfaction, what could be more natural than that he should allure weak minds to aid him by the promise of aiding them in return to the possession of whatever they may most desire? It was not by chance that a belief in the devil spread itself into a belief in sorcery, and that the latter, having fallen into ruins, involves with it the former. If there is a devil, there are sorcerers, and since there are no sorcerers, there is no devil. The good sense of three hundred

years culminates in this conclusion; let him refute it who can!

The eighteenth century was in the wrong to imagine that traditional faith could be destroyed by ridicule. Over those convictions which have deep root in the human soul, a laugh has no power in the end; but concerning the devil, the laughter of the eighteenth century has been victorious. For indeed the devil is ridiculous. This being who was thought so skillful, so malicious, such an ingenious egotist, and who kept himself active forever in the miserable business of corrupting human souls, proves himself but a fool. Looked at narrowly, brought down from his heights of poetry and mysticism, he is stupid enough; and this being clearly seen, it is impossible longer to do him the honor of admitting his real existence.

We might prolong this study, examining the books which have kept up the controversy even to the present day, but to us it seems needless. Nothing can be more wearisome and futile than the efforts of some reactionary theologians in Germany and elsewhere to give an air of reality to this ancient phantom, and at the same time to avoid falling into the gross superstitions which our ancestors themselves gave up. It is in vain to attempt to keep some place for him in dogmatic treatises or pietistic canticles. The sound part of the clergy and of the people will but smile or be irritated. It is allowed yet to Satan to be a type, an expression, a symbol consecrated by usage, but this is all. As to giving him any position in laws, in customs, in real life, the thing is impossible.

Yet, in conclusion, can nothing be drawn from this long error which holds so great a place in the history of all religions, and ascends to their very earliest developments? Must we admit that the human mind has nourished itself for so many ages upon the absolutely false? This surely cannot be. There must be something in human nature which has pleaded in its favor, and maintained across the generations a faith thus contrary to experience. I will not say, with some thinkers, that it is of value as explaining the problem of the origin of evil, for it does not offer any such solution. It only ban-

ishes the problem from earth, leaving it insoluble as ever. That which has kept alive a belief in the devil is rather this — the power of evil within us and around us. I admire the singular composure with which many philosophers encounter this question, or rather turn away from it, to expatiate in eloquent sentences about free will. Let us meet the reality bravely. The simple truth is that the best among us is far below the ideal which he proposes to himself, that he has not the strength to attain it, and that he will confess this whenever he speaks sincerely. Still another fact is that we are drawn away every moment to evil by the influences which surround us, and that very few have the energy to strive against the current. At the same time, it is not needful to fall into the excess of those theologians who have taught that human nature was totally depraved. Observation attests that we are selfish, yet capable of affection; naturally drawn by the senses, yet not less naturally attracted by the splendor of Truth and Goodness; very imperfect, yet perfectible. The first condition of progress is to feel where we are deficient. To live on good terms with our conscience, we must triumph over the daily assaults of selfishness, of the flesh, and of the world. This is the power of Satan from which we desire to be set free. Against these pernicious seductions, these fatal sorceries, we must strive, that our true self, our moral personality, disengage itself victorious from all that is earthy and sensual; thus only will it attain those pure regions of liberty and light where nothing that resembles Satan can come to molest the soul rising upwards to its God. This is all that remains of the doctrine of the devil, but this is a matter vital to our moral health, and one which must never be lost from sight.

GENERAL REVIEW.

Trinitarian Universalists.

We have purposed for a long time to call the attention of our readers to a pamphlet of 136 pages, which we have had for many years, bearing the following title:

THE EVANGELISTS MANUAL; or, a Guide to Trinitarian Universalists. Containing Articles explanatory of the Doctrines, Tenets and Faith of the Associates of the Primitive, Apostolic Church of Trinitarian Universalists, in the City of Charleston. To which is Prefixed Five Introductory Sections, and the Eighteen Articles of the Church, concluded with Thirteen Propositions, and an Appeal to the Christian World. With a copious Index. By an Associate Member. Charleston: approved and accepted by the Associates, December 31, 1827. Prepared, at their request, for Publication, July 23, 1829. Printed by A. F. Cunningham, December, 1829, at 36 Queen Street, Charleston, S. C.

The work, printed more than forty years ago, is divided into five sections: 1. Scripture Testimonies in support of Universal Redemption. 2. Testimony of the Apostolic and Early Fathers. 3. Testimony of Ecclesiastical and other Writers. 4. The Doctrines and Tenets of the Church or Association explained. 5. A Theory and Defence of the Holy Trinity, with copious Remarks and Illustrations.

The *Preface* states that the object of the Association is to approach the primitive faith and practice of the Apostolic Church, and this publication is made with a view to inform the Christian world of their agreement with evangelical sects on all points excepting that of universal salvation. To use their own words:

"We had charitably hoped that, in the present enlightened age, writers, critics and censors, must, or ought to have known, that there are various classes of *Universalists:* some who differ from other Christian believers in no one point except as it regards *the nature and duration of future punishments;* but who as tenaciously cling to all the *essential doctrines of the Scriptures*, as any other denomination of Christians; that there are *Universalists* who agree with the former in no one point but that which regards *the limited and disciplinary nature of future punishment;* that there are some who have adopted the *Arian*, others the *Socinian*, errors; and again, some who deny any future punishment at all; while others deny that there will be any resurrection, and are hence modern *Sadducees.*"

The "Manual" constantly, as in this paragraph, protests against Unitarianism, and refuses fellowship to all Universalists adopting this

dangerous doctrine. Indeed, the authors of the pamphlet seem rather more anxious, if possible, to establish their Trinitarianism than their Universalism. The Essay in defence of the Trinity, Sect. v., fills some fifty pages out of one hundred and thirty, beside frequent reiterations of their belief on this point in other parts of the work. This Essay on "The Holy and Undivided Trinity" is drawn up with elaborate care, and with a great display of metaphysics and logic, abounding in *Propositions*, *Axioms*, *Definitions*, *Remarks*, etc. It employs Scripture, Church History, and all the subtleties of theological argument, in support of the dogma, and shows extensive reading and some learning.[1] On page 46 we have the following:

"As believers in, and adherents to, the faith of the Primitive Church, and the doctrines of the Evangelists, we agree with the Apostles, with Origen, and all those early Fathers of the Church already enumerated, and with Winchester, Relly, Murray, Chauncey, and all Bible Universalists, in *the essential divinity of the Son of God!* whose union with the Father, and by virtue of the union subsisting between *Him* and the *human nature entire*, his righteousness will ultimately, through faith, be imputed *to all the members of his body*, which are *all mankind*, and so *all mankind will finally be saved.*"

The sections on Universalism reveal a diligent study of the Scriptures, and present the testimonies of the inspired writers beginning with Moses, running through all the prophets, evangelists and apostles, including the teachings of the Master himself, and ending with Paul, of whom it is said, "We come lastly to that great *Practical* Universalist, whose miraculous conversion, eminent learning, and steady devotion to the great and glorious cause, bespoke him to be not only happily *elected* or chosen for this purpose by the wisdom of God, but also as most eminently qualified to illustrate and explain it to the world."

The argument from the Apostolic and Church Fathers is prepared with much labor, and embraces the usual testimonies in proof of the Universalism of the early church, and dwells especially upon the passages from Origen, his labors, and the history of the controversy which grew out of the jealousy of Demetrius of Alexandria. In section iii. of this division we have the testimonies of Modern Ecclesiastical Historians, and other writers, in favor of Universalism; and under this head are given the familiar names of Dr. Hartley, Bp. New-

[1] Nevertheless it repeatedly speaks in high commendation of that "admirable work 'On the Atonement,' by Hosea Ballou, of Boston."

ton. Jeremy White, Dr. Cheyne. Archbishop Tillotson, Dr. Chauncey. Petitpierre. Chevalier Ramsay, etc., ending with Dr. Dwight's statement respecting Universalism in Germany.

The following statement of the manner in which the authors of the work became believers will interest our readers:

"We are Universalists, both of necessity and of choice, not by man's persuasion, for we received not this doctrine of man, neither were we taught it by man, but by the Word and Spirit of God, while 'searching the Scriptures.' It is now forty years since one of us was convicted of the truth of this glorious doctrine, by searching the Scriptures; but was for many years deterred from a public profession of this faith, through the influence of individuals of whose piety he was well assured. The doctrine was deemed a dangerous one, calculated to lead men into careless indifference, into all manner of evil; that it was, in short, a doctrine of devils, etc.

Youth, awed by the experience of age, and the sanctity of the clerical character, originated doubts, which occasioned many and painful struggles to disbelieve and invalidate the testimony in favor of this Evangelical Faith. But the truth at length prevailed; it was more and more developed, by a continued reference to the Scriptures, by a serious contemplation of the character and attributes of God's manifested properties, essential and natural, until it became at length identified with our nature and reason, and we are hence Universalists of choice as well as of necessity.

With the exception of a Tract of eight pages, containing a selection of texts in support of this doctrine, we have never seen, until within a few years, any work in favor of it, nor have we to this date ever heard a sermon preached in its defence, by any man. The Bible, the Bible alone, has been the holy instrument in awakening, convicting, convincing and confirming us in this Faith; and hence it is that we prefer the name of Bible Universalists. This sublime doctrine arrested our attention first, in the year 1789, and though resisted as already noticed, for many years, has been at last, despite of all opposition to the contrary, triumphant.

In the course of conversation, we have discovered many, of different churches, whose religious faith was precisely the same as ours. But as they, as well as ourselves, were ignorant of each other's sentiments, as there were no ministers, no building appropriated to the service of God in this way in Charleston, we continued attendance in those churches whose doctrines and tenets approached more nearly than others to our own. Need we say, this approach to our faith is most perspicuous in the Moravian and among Arminian Christians. In 1824, a few individuals agreed to associate as members, by Faith, of that church, which they conscientiously believed to be the primitive, apostolic church of Christ, and attending to the command, 'Thus said the Lord, stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old

paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls' (Jer. vi. 16). They esteem this the old path, the good way, and by the grace of God they will walk in it, assured they shall find rest to their souls."

The "Declaration of Faith" embraces nineteen Articles, Of God, Of the Son and the Holy Ghost, Of the Atonement, Of the Descent of Christ into Hades, Of the Sacraments, or Baptism and the Lord's Supper, Of Christian Perfection, Of the Holy Scriptures, Of the Punishment of the Impenitent and Wicked, Of the Order of the Church and Authority of its Rulers, Of the Civil Authority, etc. Below we give several of these in part, remarking only that they are all illustrated and supported by citations from Scripture and otherwise:

"ART. V. *Of Atonement.* — Atonement is the act of making satisfaction for wrongs or injuries done; and involves in its nature the expiation of offences by offering an equivalent — the restitution, or restoration, to a state prior to that which has rendered an atonement necessary. The reconciliation of the offender to a state of acceptance with Justice and Truth, and the making satisfaction to a dissatisfied being."

"ART. VII. *Of the descent of Christ into Hades* (iu the English version translated *Hell*). — We believe that Christ was 'put to death in the flesh, being quickened by the Spirit, by which also he went and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah,' etc. (1 Pet. iii. 18, 19). We consider the object of our dear Redeemer, in preaching to the spirits of the dead, in their prison, or *Hades*, was to offer them salvation on his own Gospel terms, in order that they might be placed upon an equal footing with the living. And that this is no visionary idea the Apostle continues in the same epistle (iv. 5, 6), and says, 'For, for this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh; but live according to God in the spirit.' We perfectly accord with the Moravian Church, *i. e.* the German Baptists, and believe that 'the souls of the Just are employed in preaching the Gospel to those who have had no revelation in this life'; and we believe that thousands are saved by this method."

"ART. IX. SEC. 1. *Of Baptism.* — We believe *Water Baptism*, or the Baptism of John, to be a sign or seal of faith, or of repentance, and is of Divine authority, and ought to be administered to all who desire to be made members of the Church of Christ. With regard to the form of administering this Sacrament, while we consider immersion as the most significant, proper and impressive, particularly in adult subjects, we allow liberty of conscience to all; wherefore, such persons as insist upon receiving this Sacrament in

the mode of sprinkling or pouring, as is the custom of some churches, ought not to be denied. We believe that *Infant Baptism*, or the Baptism of such as are under years, to be, if not actually commanded, very strongly implied, in the Holy Scriptures. The covenants of God with his people in the Mosaic Dispensation included children as well as adults, and we can see no reason why they should be excluded in the Christian Dispensation from entering into the covenant mercies of the Redeemer."

"Art. XIII. *Of the Holy Scriptures.*—We believe in, and joyfully accept, the Holy Scriptures, contained in the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments, as the oracles of God; 'that all his Scriptures are given by his divine inspiration'; and in this view, and with this faith, we do most gratefully and sincerely receive them as the next best evidence of his eternal and unalterable Love wherewith he loved, and still loves us, to that of the gift of his Son and Spirit, for the regeneration, reconciliation, and final salvation of all men.

We receive the Bible as the Will of our Heavenly Father: the New Testament as a codicil to that Will, by which a more glorious provision has been made for the Son and heir of God; by which 'the heathen is his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth are his possession,' and by which all mankind are made the heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ.

In this Will, which is ratified by the oath of the Father, signed, sealed and executed with the blood of the Son, perfected and recorded by the Holy Spirit, and witnessed by all God's holy prophets and apostles since the world began, we discover the greatest of all treasures, the richest of all legacies; enough to enrich all the sons and daughters of Adam!"

"Art. XIV. Sec. 1. *Of the Universal Church of Christ.*—The visible Church of Christ is constituted of faithful men and women, among every sect and denomination of Christians, whether they are attached to the Primitive Apostolic Church, or to the Roman or Greek Church, whether Protestants or Dissenters, provided they walk in the light, as he is in the light. These are they of whom it is said, *God is the special Saviour*, being saved in this life from the fear of death, and of a judgment to come, shall share in the first resurrection, and over whom the second death hath no power. These are a manifestation of Christ's visible body, or Church.

2. His invisible Church we believe to consist of the entire residue of the human family, who are also, according to the foreknowledge and eternal purposes of God in Christ, members of his body, to be hereafter made manifest. These are they who are not *specially saved* in this life from the fear of death and of judgment, but have dreadful forebodings of the evils to come, with a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall destroy the adversaries."

"Art. XVI. *Of the Punishment of the Impenitent and Wicked.* . . As we believe in the general resurrection, and the great judgment,

so do we also believe in future rewards and punishments. We do most truly believe that the Righteous Judge of all the earth will most faithfully and impartially reward every man according to his works; that the wicked will be punished *according to the correct meaning* of the Scriptures of his truth."

The following article will probably lead our readers, as it did us, to wish that the "Primitive, Apostolic and Catholic Church of Trinitarian Universalists in the City of Charleston" had gathered into its bosom, and held to its Articles, the entire population of that guilty and traitorous city, down to, and during, the memorable year 1861. Had it been so, it might have been that loyalty and obedience would have prevailed over treason and rebellion, and the country saved the horrors of that wicked war:

"ART. XVIII. *Of the Civil Authority.*—As Citizens, we profess our allegiance to the Government of the United States, and our obedience to the civil authorities, in all things lawful and right. And inasmuch as the Constitution of these United States guarantees to all Christian denominations liberty of conscience, and secures to each the free and lawful exercise of their civil and religious liberties, we believe that it is lawful and right for Christians, when required by the said authorities, to take up arms in defence of their country, and for the mutual protection of their own liberties, and the liberty of these United States."

Geological Discoveries in California.

ACCORDING to the testimony of the San Francisco correspondent of a Southern paper, the Pacific country is wonderfully rich in fossils of the early geological eras of our earth. If his statements are reliable, discoveries have been made recently which, if made in this part of the country, or in Europe, would set the savans half crazy with excitement, and open the way for learned discussions and dissertations without number or end. We give below the substance of some of these statements, beginning with what is said to be apparently an immense sea monster:

"It lies on a high plateau, about one hundred miles to the southeast of Hamilton, Nevada, and from its position it is supposed that the locale was once a great shoal, and that the leviathian floundered and perished on its surface as the water receded. The petrifaction is perfect, and is estimated to weigh about ten tons. It has the head and body of a humpbacked whale, while the extremities extend into

feelers and antennæ, like the polypus or devil fish, with the exception that they were evidently lined. during life, with a hard and bony substance. The head is flat and oblong, with eyes set on each side twenty-four inches apart. The mouth is armed with triple rows of teeth, sharp in front, but underneath and well into the jaws they turn into grinders, capped by a solid osseous formation. The length of this singular relic of an unknown age has not yet been determined, but as the body blends into the tail it tapers down into so small a size that, making due allowance, its weight would not be far from that stated.

At the present time there is on exhibition in the city the tusk and some teeth of an antediluvian animal, whose magnitude must have dwarfed into littleness the most monstrous mastodon or megatherium of which we have any account — a beast so large as almost to defy the power of imagination to conjure up an image so vast before the mind's eye. The remains were discovered very recently in a formation of cement and lava near Stockton, in this State. One of the teeth weighs ninety-five pounds, and the tusk is of such immense proportions that the creature to which it belonged must have been several hundred feet long, and weighed hundreds of tons.

Last week the petrified claws of an immense lobster or crawfish, measuring a foot and a half in length, were found in a drift in a Mount Diablo gravel bed, five hundred feet above tide level, and the papers contain accounts of the discovery of a perfect petrified seal in the White Pine country, together with a great variety of curious fossils. Indeed, the coast abounds with relics of antediluvian and possibly pre-Adamite monsters, and every square mile of ground shows evidence of the fearful convulsions that agitated the globe when these tremendous creations of the Supreme Being were coffined in stone."

The New Catholic Protestants of Europe.

It is well known that there was a wide-spread feeling against the doctrine of Papal Infallibility and the action of the Vatican Council, among the more intelligent classes of Catholics in Europe, and especially among the scholars and universities of Germany. Many of those, however, who at first set themselves in opposition to it, afterward yielded either to the blandishments or the terrors of Rome, accepted the decision of the Council, and made their peace with the Pope. On the other hand, there were many, and these the most distinguished for their learning and influence, who could not be won over to the abomination, nor driven into submission to it. Of this number is Dr. Dollinger, the celebrated Professor of Theology at

Munich, the most learned champion of the Romish Church in Germany, perhaps in the world.

From the beginning he has respectfully protested against the absurd dogma, which was carried through the Council by Jesuitical diplomacy and intrigue and the personal influence of the Pope. At last his protest grew to be so earnest and bold that it caused serious uneasiness at the Vatican, and the Archbishop of Munich was ordered to threaten him with excommunication unless he recanted; a punishment which, as the sturdy Protestant says, "is used only against priests guilty of gross moral crimes, and even seldom against them." Undaunted by this threat he demanded, in the spirit of Luther, to be heard before a council of German bishops, or a commission of the Cathedral Chapter, and promised to prove: That the decree of Infallibility is against Scripture as interpreted unanimously by the Fathers; that it is in the teeth of the traditions and church history of the first thousand years; that the bishops who voted it were deceived by false text-books; that in the fifteenth century two general Councils and several Popes decided the direct opposite of the dogma; and lastly, that it is in conflict with the laws and constitution of Bavaria and the States of Europe, on which point he appeals to any legal faculty in Germany which the Archbishop may see fit to select. Towards the conclusion of his able letter, in which he says "thousands of the clergy and hundreds of thousands of the laity think as I do," he sums up thus:

"As a Christian, as a theologian, as a historian, as a citizen, I cannot accept this doctrine. Not as a Christian, for it is irreconcilable with the spirit of the Gospel and with the plain words of Christ and of the Apostles; it purposes just that establishment of the kingdom of this world which Christ rejected, it claims that rule over all communions which Peter forbids to all and to himself. Not as theologian, for the whole true tradition of the Church is in irreconcilable opposition to it. Not as historian can I accept it, for as such I know that the persistent endeavor to realize this theory of a kingdom of the world has cost Europe rivers of blood, has confounded and degraded whole countries, has shaken the beautiful organic architecture of the elder Church, and has begotten, fed and sustained the worst abuses in the Church. Finally, as a citizen, I must put it away from me, because by its claims on the submission of States and monarchs, and of the whole political order under the Papal power, and by the exceptional position which it claims for the clergy, it lays the foundation of endless, ruinous dispute between State and Church, between clergy and laity."

Of course to all this the Archbishop made the usual reply: "The Church has spoken, and that is the end of the matter. No discussion of the question can be permitted." All the proofs which the Professor might bring against the dogma, whether from the Scriptures, the Fathers, the Councils, or even the Popes themselves, would go for nothing; and all he had to do was to give in his adhesion to what had been decreed. Refusing thus to stultify himself, nothing was left but to pass upon him the sentence of excommunication. This has now been done, but its consequences promise to be much more important and far-reaching than the Pope and his advisers dreamt of.[1]

It has already called out many expressions of fellowship and support, and shows clearly that all Catholics are not Papists; that there are many who are not yet ready to surrender conscience and common sense at the bidding of the old man of the Vatican. A meeting has been held in Munich to support the recusant Professor, which was attended by about four hundred Catholics, some of whom used strong language. One of the speakers declared that "whoever made the utterances of Rome his own, could no longer be a citizen of the State, but stood outside it — the servant of a Power hostile to the State." The meeting adopted an address to the King of Bavaria, in which he was petitioned to instruct the Ministry of Home Affairs to use all the means in its power to forbid the doctrine of Papal Infallibility being taught in public seminaries, and to bring about a new settlement of the relations of Church and State. And his Majesty has since not only declared his intention of retaining the offending Canon in his position at the Chapel Royal, but has written him a gracious letter expressing regret at his excommunication. Beside this, an overwhelming majority of his fellow-professors in the University of Munich have signed an address in which they say,

"Eight months ago did we, in conjunction with the other universi-

[1] He now lies under the "Excommunicatio major." This completely excludes him from the Church, and being rendered incapable of acquiring any Church benefice, he is likewise prevented from receiving Church burial. This exclusion also carries with it the "Excommunicatio minor" for every member of the Church who keeps up any communication with him so long as he is thus outlawed; and this falls upon the King of Bavaria and a large number of other distinguished persons.

Dr. Friederich, also a professor in the Munich University, who was excommunicated the day after his brother professor, has openly declared his intention of ignoring the sentence altogether, and going on with his duties as if nothing had happened. And another Bavarian professor, Dr. Seppe, who is said to have been heretofore one of the great champions of Ultramontanism, has also distinctly pronounced against Papal Infallibility.

ties of Germany, protest against the resolutions which the Pope, together with the majority of the so-called Vatican Council, tried to impose upon Catholic Christianity. Since then the work of violence begun by Rome has been continued, and while the German people has fought upon many battle-fields, and gained its place of honor among the nations, a great number of the bishops of the German people have undertaken the inglorious task, in the service of unchristian tyranny, to oppress the conscience, to bring confusion and anguish into innumerable pious and honest hearts, to persecute the steadfast adherents of their old faith, and to bind all of us, as far as in them lies, in the fetters of an absolutism which endeavors to put itself in the place of reason and right, of tradition and gospel."

While, they continue, it is in such times of danger the special mission of the high schools of Germany to uphold the liberty of conscience and of science, and to stand up manfully for violated truth, it is especially upon Dr. Dollinger that their eyes are fixed, who by his manful declaration has proved himself the worthy champion of a great and holy cause. Still farther, the Municipal Council of Vienna, the capital of that Austria so lately the chief supporter of the usurpations of the Pope and the impudent pretensions of the Jesuits, by a large majority adopted an address expressing their cordial sympathy with his Protestant resistance to the despotism of the Roman Church.

But the most surprising fact connected with this movement is that he has been sustained in his protest and urged to the conflict by the Professors of the *Roman University!* These Italian scholars declare, in their address of sympathy, that "in the sacred cause of reform the German and the Italian people will fight and conquer together." They say boldly,

"The Episcopacy which dwells in our land is of no country, and has nothing in common with the Italian people. The syllabus, infallibility, Papal autocracy — all these negations of divine and human reason — compose a system which has no connection with the Italian character, with Italian thought. Our Roman, that is to say, Italian race, abhors as much as the Germanic that evil system of the bondage of the understanding."

Verily, we have a free Italy at last. But how must this sound in the ears of the Pope, uttered as it is under the very eaves of the Vatican? How little he and his plotting Jesuits understood what they were doing during those days of supreme folly in the Œcumenical Council. How little they foresaw what a mighty revolutionary force they were setting in motion.

The *London Times* justly declares that a protest thus initiated, thus deeply founded in the nature of the people, in the circumstances of the moment, and thus powerfully supported, cannot end in the mere secession of a few priests and doctors of divinity. We may be on the eve of a schism similar in importance to that of the fifteenth century, and we may possibly see the birth of a new religious system, or the resuscitation of an old one, which will ultimately solve the perplexities of those races which can neither endure the incurable corruption of Roman Catholicism nor adapt themselves to the forms of distinctive Protestantism. We must wait with anxiety to see how Dr. Dollinger's protest works itself out. Like Luther, he and his adherents must, if they have life in them, go further. They may for the moment disguise it to themselves, but they have proclaimed, like the great reformer, the cardinal principle of the liberty of conscience, and have denied the primary assumption of their Church. Luther said at Worms, "It is not safe for a man to act against his conscience," and these words have practically been re-asserted by Dr. Dollinger. But conscience, once emancipated, and enthroned in its just independence, is an agent of irresistible and inexhaustible energy. Like the genius of the Arabian tale, it may long be confined by a mere charm, but when at length it rises it is with the stature and the might of a giant.

The Future Life Revealed by Jesus.

Among the early Hebrews the soul in the future world was a mere shadow, without the power to do or enjoy, and scarcely conscious indeed. Its habitation was a most uninviting region, dismal and gloomy to the last degree; and to be preserved from going down into it was regarded as a special favor.

So among the heathen, the joys of heaven were only the shadowy, unreal repetition of the pleasures and pursuits which were most preferred and followed while on the earth, as war, hunting, chariot racing, the social song, etc. And these were pursued in Elysium under such disadvantages that they were very far from satisfying the departed spirit, or making it content with its lot. So wide of this was it, that the most favored and happy spirits longed to return to earth again; regarding a life in the body, amid the pleasant scenes of this world, as infinitely preferable to any joy or blessedness their

heaven could afford. The future life of the soul presented nothing attractive, nothing like intellectual and purely spiritual enjoyment. Holiness, activity, knowledge, progress, — these seemed to have no part nor lot in the employments and joys of the heathen heaven.

Wholly unlike this is the teaching of Jesus respecting the joys of heaven, and the character of the future life of the soul. There is nothing earthly or gross in the delights and pleasures of that world to which it goes. Purity; spirituality; fellowship with God and his angels; knowledge; ever-increasing power; progress forward and upward; a wider and clearer vision; the soul growing always with the extending field of its operations, unfolding new capacities for blessedness, and forever flowing in upon it the glory, and wonder, and beauty of God's infinite universe — these make up in part the splendid inheritance of Life and Immortality brought to life by Jesus the Christ. These help to constitute that future existence revealed in the Gospel, which is not like the heathen Elysium, most unwelcome, and which its inhabitants would gladly exchange for the meanest and sorrowfulest place on earth; but a world to which the true believer looks forward with hope and joy — a spiritual world of whose glory and blessedness, it is written, "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard; neither hath it entered into the heart to conceive."

Confident and full of earnestness and holy exultation is the speech of those who accepted the divine doctrine of Jesus — as unlike the speech of the pagan as the noon sun is unlike a dim, expiring taper. "I desire to depart and be with Christ." "We are confident and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." "The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us . . . because the creature itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," and "with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, we shall be changed into the same image from glory to glory" forever.

Such is the character of that future existence which the Gospel revealed as the God-given heritage of the soul! And how far above the dark, dismal Sheol of the Hebrews, — how far above the phantasms of earthly pleasures renewed in the heathen Elysium! And

how fully does the comparison justify Paul's declaration respecting Jesus — "He brought Life and Immortality to light!" 2 Tim. i. 10.

And here we pause a moment to look at this passage — "brought life and immortality to light." In what sense is this true? In the sense already set forth; but also in another and more important sense, as we shall see.

The doctrine of a life after death which to some would be a blessing, and to others a curse; a life in which the good would rejoice, and the wicked be subjected to torments lasting as long as the life itself should last — this was believed before the Saviour lived and taught. It was the popular creed of the heathen, and the faith of the Jews in the time of Christ. So it is most manifest that if Christ taught only the doctrine of a future life, without reference to its character — or if he taught a future life in which a part of mankind were to be blessed, and a part cursed; in which the good were to be saved, while no provision was made for the purification and restoration of the bad — then, beyond dispute, the claim set up by Paul cannot be allowed. All religions had found out a way to save the good — but the bad, the sinful, for whom the heart went into mourning, of whom the world had no hope — these were given over to remediless depravity and sinfulness, to demons and endless tortures.

Now if Christ did no more than this, if he taught the same thing, if he revealed the same kind of a future life; an immortality of sin and woe, as well as of holiness and joy — then there was no revelation at all. He did *not* bring this to light in any sense; for all this was brought to light, and the subject of the popular knowledge and creed, centuries before the face of Jesus was seen, or his voice lifted up, in the earth. But a future life which should be a heaven, a spiritual heritage for all; a future life which should devise a way for saving the sinful instead of abandoning them to hopeless evil and misery; which should deliver them from the bondage of corruption, and renew within the purity and beauty of God's likeness; a future life which should show an absence of all sorrow and pain, of every element of evil; a future life in which all the seeming discords of this life shall blend into one magnificent harmony of good, of love and praise — this is what no religion ever revealed, what no sage ever taught, to the *people;* but this is the glory of the man Christ Jesus; this the Life and Immortality which *he* brought to light.

For this the world had long waited, and vainly looked to the speculations of the philosopher, to the minister at the altar, to the teach-

ings of the priest; but only in Christ did it find the truth so earnestly sought, only in his divine revelations did it find life and immortality brought to light in a way to make them of any real worth. From him at last the dying caught a ray of light that illuminated the path into the valley of death. From him the mourner obtained that comfort so needful to the afflicted and broken heart. From him the weak gathered divine strength; and the blinded spiritual sight; and the timid and doubting a heavenly courage which enabled them to meet death without fear, nay, even with triumph and joy.

This it is that gives dignity and supremacy, more than all else, to the Christian religion as a new revelation, as the highest and perfectest expression of the purpose and grace of God. This it is that establishes the truth and justice of the claim that Christ brought Life and Immortality to light — a Life whose spiritual character surpasses the loftiest speculations of the philosopher, and the most beautiful dreams of the poet; a Life whose holiness and blessedness shall be the final portion of every child of humanity, the humblest, the poorest, the most hopeless; and so answers, as never before it was done, the wishes, and prayers, and the noblest sympathies, of the human heart.

Take this away from the revelation of Jesus, and we take away the brightest diamond in the crown of its divinity. Take away this great central truth of universal harmony in the spiritual world, and we take away all meaning from the otherwise significant and eloquent words of the inspired apostle of Jesus.

The Universalist Publishing House.

THE Universalist Publishing House has become the property of the Denomination. We make this announcement with a pleasure not often experienced, for we see in it the germ of a great power for good, a power by which the Truth shall in time be put on a level with Error in the use of the most potent instrumentality of the age — the Press. In saying this we do not forget the Pulpit; but in the discussion of theological and biblical questions, in the statement, illustration and defence of the doctrines of our Church, in the extent of its influence among the masses, in the instruction and enlightenment of thousands who seldom hear a sermon, the Press with its religious weeklies, its monthly magazines and Quarterlies, with its

books and pamphlets and tracts broadcast upon the winds of heaven, has great opportunities and agencies for building up the cause of Truth, for reaching the millions with the Gospel message, from whom the stated Pulpit is shut out by the very limitations of its office. And the Agent of the Publishing House justifies this statement in his late excellent Report:

"I have received appeals for our publications from all the States of the South, from both whites and freedmen; from over the ocean, from Scotland and England; they have come to me, too, from the native Indians of our country. From the Northern States and Canadas the appeal is almost daily. These appeals have come from institutions of learning of all grades and kinds, from public libraries and reading rooms, from struggling Sunday Schools and new societies, and from scattered believers. We are not compelled to open the door for the distribution of our literature, for the door is flung wide open for us. Surely our people will not be inconsistent with their faith that the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, but will take advantage of these opportunities which a good Providence is giving us, as he is giving to no other people."

We cordially agree with this suggestion. The Denomination has now in the Publishing House a property of nearly $40,000, free of debt. It is a noble gift on the part of the stockholders and subscribers, not forgetting the large share due to the good judgment and careful management of Agents and Directors during the eight years since the commencement of the enterprise. With this the liberal men of our faith, not the rich alone, have an objective point for their offerings, something to give to. The sum named is only a beginning, but, as said, we look forward to the time when by the generous benefactions of the faithful it will stand financially and as a denominational power by the side of the Methodist Book Concern; and in the honesty of its management far before it, we trust.

The Board of Trustees to whose care this valuable property is committed for denominational uses, is composed of men from all the New England States, well known for their ability and devotion to our cause. Let every Universalist buy of this House, whether his purchases are denominational or otherwise, remembering that every dollar of profit which he pays into its treasury will be doubly and trebly returned to him in the increased prosperity of our cause.

Religious World.

SOME time ago we called the attention of our readers to certain facts indicative of the liberal tendency, in religious things, of the English Queen and some members of her family. It is well known that the favorite book of Prince Albert, and his constant companion, was Schokke's "Meditations on Death," a work everywhere, in word and spirit, breathing the doctrine of Universalism. This German work the Queen greatly admired, and caused to be translated into English for general circulation among her subjects; a thing she would scarcely have done if she had regarded its Universalism as dangerous heresy. Then Charles Kingsley, her private chaplain, is an open and avowed believer in the final destruction of sin and evil, as his preaching and writings show; and Brooke, her chaplain in ordinary, is an equally outspoken advocate of the same great doctrine of the Gospel, as witnessed by his published sermons. These things, and others which might be added, show clearly enough that Victoria is not a slave to the creeds or forms of the Established Church, of which she is the legal as well as the Ecclesiastical Head.

We do not know how far she sympathizes with the movement in Parliament for the separation of the Church from the State, but there are other reasons for believing that she is personally in favor of it, beside those given in the paragraph below. At any rate, the movement is generally regarded as significant, and one of the most interesting and important events in the history of the Church since the Reformation. The *Episcopalian*, the Low Church organ, expresses the opinion that the measure is destined at no distant period to be carried through to completion, and says that then,

"The ruling sovereign of Great Britain will not be obliged to belong to the Episcopal Church. The Royal family may then follow the convictions of their minds and judgment in regard to the obligation of observing 'days and seasons and times and years' without any criticism on the part of churchmen of any description. As it is, the Queen has asserted her right to follow her own interpretations of church rubrics and antiquated or hardly enforced regulations. She communed in a Presbyterian Church, and received the pulpit ministrations of those not of 'Apostolical succession,' and thus showed her estimation of the worth of that doctrine. No matter what the motive was, the act was a decided and emphatic protest against Episcopal exclusiveness. It was telling, welcomed, and highly appreciated by half and more than half her kingdom. Then, again, the marriage of her daughter in Lent, and the joyful festivi-

ties on Good Friday, have shown the resolve to bring these observances of the mediæval and betogged primitive ages to an end."

— A Zurich newspaper announces the startling discovery, said to have been made in the environs of Cairo, of the foundations of a town built by the Hebrews during their sojourn in the land of Egypt. The learned are engaged in deciphering some inscriptions found there which are expected to add new light and confirmation to the Exodus. Looking to the complete preservation in Egypt of monuments of even remoter date, such a discovery is certainly possible, whether it has actually occurred or not.

— The statue of Daiboots, an image of Buddha, referred to below, is described by Prof. Pumpelly as a most wonderful work of art. It is cast in sections of a few square feet each, the bronze an inch or more thick, and the joints are so perfect that now, after the lapse of centuries, they can only be detected where the weather has made them visible by discoloration:

"It is of colossal size, in a sitting posture, measuring about forty feet in height. It is of the purest bronze, and admirably executed as a work of art. Its origin is unknown; but it has sat in the same spot, on an elevated platform, at least six hundred years. This remarkable relic of the past is about to be destroyed. The late persecution against native Christians in Japan seems not to have been directed against that faith alone, but against Buddhism also, or, in other words, against image-worship in general. Buddhists and Roman Catholics alike have images in their temples of worship, and the iconoclastic zeal of the Japanese faith, as by law established (Shintooism), which is seeking to break up all image-worship, has found expression in an edict dooming to destruction this great image of Buddha. The statue is offered for sale, not to be retained in its present position, but to be broken up for old bronze."

— Orthodoxy is evidently extending the borders of its thought and teaching on some important doctrines of the Gospel. The *Congregationalist* has come to believe that Christian Salvation is something more than barely escaping from hell, and Heaven something more than singing hymns and playing on golden harps through all eternity. In a recent article on this subject, it says:

"Is it not enough to be saved? If to be saved is simply to miss perdition, it is not enough. If it is to be, first, rescued from ruin, and then to go on in unending progress in holy and blissful activity in heaven, it is enough. No human aspiration can reach higher.

Do not mistake. We do not call it a light thing barely to reach heaven. But the glory of heaven only *begins* at the gates of pearl. To get within them is to forever escape from sin and sorrow, and to dwell in the ineffable Light. But there will be progress there, and some will begin their heavenly service far in advance of others. And more progress on earth will tell upon the progress there."

Farther, in noticing the volume of the "Ante Nicene Library," containing the writings of *Tertullian*, who lived A. D. 200–220, it calls him "a fiery ascetic, whose opinions, if he were now alive, would not be worth a feather, but who, because he lived in the second century, is a part of the history of the church." This is very good for an orthodox verdict respecting the man who has the honor of being the first in the Christian Church who defended the Pagan dogma of endless punishment; and who, in such a sweet spirit of compassion and forgiveness, exclaimed, "How shall I admire, how laugh, how rejoice, how exult, when I behold so many kings and magistrates and philosophers liquefying in fiercer flames than they ever kindled against Christians!"

—To speak of *Robespierre* as having even a decent respect for religion or morals may seem incongruous to those who associate his name with little beside the guillotine and the crowd of victims which he sent to it. Many, however, who have borne a better name than he have failed to comprehend and apply the truth he proclaimed in '93, when churches were robbed and closed, and priests were imprisoned and murdered, as they have just now been in Paris. A French paper called the attention of the *Commune* and the authors of the late excesses to his words on the question of religious toleration and worship.

"By what right (said he) should men hitherto unknown in the march of the revolution come in the midst of these events to seek a false popularity, sowing discord among us, disturbing liberty of worship in the name of liberty, attacking fanaticism by fresh fanaticism, and making the homage due to pure truth degenerate into ridiculous farces? Why should they be permitted thus to play with the dignity of the people, and fasten the bells of folly to the very sceptre of reason? It has been supposed that by receiving civic offerings the Convention had proscribed Catholic worship. No, the Convention has not taken this rash step; it never will do so. Its intention is to maintain the liberty of worship which it has proclaimed, and at the same time to repress those who abuse it to the disturbance of public order. Priests have been denounced for having said mass; they will

say it longer if you seek to prevent them from saying it. He who tries to prevent mass from being said is more fanatical than he who says it. There are men who claim to make a religion of atheism. Every philosopher, every individual, can on this point adopt whatever opinion he pleases. He who would make it a crime in him would be a madman; but the legislator who should adopt such a system would be a hundred times more mad."

— Curious are the religious revelations consequent upon the political changes of Europe. A young American was lately found distributing St. Paul's "Epistle to the Romans" and other portions of Scripture, under the very dome of St. Peter's at Rome. The officials sought to prevent and stop it, and the police were called in to drive the heretics from the sacred place; but finding them doing nothing worse, they refused, and asked for copies themselves, saying, "This is what we have long wanted." Beside this a new Methodist Chapel has just been opened in Rome, which the *Tablet* says "is the sixteenth heretical temple which has been erected by the Revolutionary party, under the eyes of the Chief of Catholicism."

During the last winter a colporteur has been preaching and distributing the Scriptures in Spain, in the towns and villages near Valladolid. The people received him kindly, and often the Alcaldes gave him permission to preach in the public halls belonging to the towns. In one village six curates signed a petition to the Alcalde, himself a priest, to stop the preaching. His answer was, "If he speaks truly, it is necessary that he should preach; if he lies, convict him of it" — which shows a more advanced state of feeling than is sometimes met with even in our country. But where are the bones of Philip II., that they do not rattle and rise up in protest?

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

---

1. Ad Fidem; or, Parish Evidences of the Bible. By Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., author of "Ecce Cœlum" and "Pater Mundi." Boston: Noyes, Holmes & Co. $1.50.

In a notice of the two previous volumes of Dr. Burr, we spoke in cordial commendation of his treatment of the themes chosen for discussion, with a condemnatory criticism of his florid and stilty style, and his free use of tremendous adjectives. In the present work both style and argument are often faulty. An author has the right, of course, to choose his own methods of reasoning, to select the side

from which he will approach the subject, and determine the kind of arguments with which to establish his thesis; but then he should choose with reference to the present conditions of the question, and the temper of the public mind, or the educated thought, respecting it. And no subject demands this careful preparation and adjustment, more than the question concerning the integrity of the Bible records, and the divine authority of the religion it reveals. We do not think Dr. Burr's method of presenting the "evidences" fortunate in any of these particulars.

The question is not how unbelievers *ought* to approach the Bible, but how they *do* approach it; not the temper of mind in which they *should* examine its claims and proofs, but in which they *do* examine them. And to do any real service to truth, the argument must be directed to the actual relations which Philosophy, Science and Historical Criticism maintain toward the Bible at this present time. Mr. Burr has not sufficiently attended to this; and accordingly often gives us hortatory eloquence where the argument requires accurate statement, severe logic, exact criticism, or scientific demonstration.

And certainly he ought to know that the day has gone by for frightening people into a belief in the Bible or Religion by repeating the worn-out stories of the American Tract Society, of men struck dead for blasphemy and impiety. Such wonders of this sort as he relates in the chapter on "Modern Signs" belong to the family of Catholic miracles; but they are not the kind of argument likely to weigh much with sceptics.

His faults of style, too, greatly weaken the effect of his arguments in many cases. He does not seem to see that the poetical enthusiasm, and the declamatory and grandiloquent picturing, which were perhaps pardonable in "Pater Mundi," are wholly out of place in a work on Bible evidences.

But, after all, there are many things in this book which, though not new, are stated in a fresh and attractive way, and are well fitted to persuade an honest and intelligent seeker after truth. Of this sort are the chapters on "Presumptions" and "Three Prophecies," and portions of several other chapters. "Ancient Wonders" is well argued, after "Leslie's Short Method," but ignores the real question of the day — the genuineness, or in other words, the authorship and date of the records. "Parish Evidences," as a popular presentation of the argument, may be useful, but it will not greatly inform the scholar or diligent student of the subject.

2. War Powers under the Constitution of the United States. Military Arrests, Reconstruction, and Military Government. Also, now first published, War Claims of Aliens. With Notes on the Acts of the Executive and Legislative Departments during Our Civil War, and a Collection of Cases Decided in the National Courts. By William Whiting. *Forty-third Edition.* Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham. $3.50.

It would not be necessary, even if we were able, to give to this *royal* octavo of 700 pages a critical review. The facts that portions

of its contents have passed through forty-three editions, thirty-two in New York and eleven in Boston; that it was prepared at the request of the Secretary of State, and used in the State, War and Navy Departments of the Government; that many of its legal opinions and principles of law have received the sanction of the Supreme Court of the United States; that it has attracted governmental attention in England, France, Germany, and several of the South American Republics, and been cited as authority by foreign statesmen and writers on international law, as well as by American lawyers in Courts of the United States — these facts furnish an endorsement of the value of this work to which no ordinary editorial criticism could add much weight.

Mr. Whiting did a noble work during the Rebellion in strengthening the hands of the government by showing the war powers which the Constitution lodged in Congress and in the President, and the right of the government to maintain itself and to perpetuate the existence and unity of the Republic; and it augurs well for the future of our country that his labors have been so universally acknowledged and applauded at home and abroad. It is an immense gain, and some compensation for the losses of the war, if North and South, if America and Europe, have learned that the United States *are united states;* not a bundle of faggots loosely tied together to be scattered by any one who may choose to snap the withe, but a solid, live white oak, glorious in the wealth of its branches, and so deeply and firmly rooted in the earth as to defy the utmost fury of the tempest.

The present edition contains a full exposition of the legal principles by which the military government and reconstruction of the rebel States has been justified and maintained; and in the important paper on the "War Claims of Aliens" a very valuable contribution is made to the volume, which will be of great use to those interested in the political issues of the time, or in those matters still pending between England and our own country. We do not see how any lawyer of ambitious aims, or any statesman, or politician, or any public library, can afford to be without this work.

3. Gutenberg, and the Art of Printing. By Emily C. Pearson, author of "Ruth's Sacrifice," etc. Boston: Noyes, Holmes & Co. $2.00.

In the beauty and finish of its issues this new firm seems to begin where others leave off. The volume is a beauty in all respects — paper, type, illustrations and binding; and the author has done her part in a manner equally satisfactory. Of course nothing very new or original could be looked for in a sketch of the invention and history of Printing, and yet the reader will find the old story told in a very pleasant and entertaining way; and, unless he has been a very diligent student of the subject, he will find some things in this book he has not met with before. One thing is certain — he will honor Gutenberg more, and Faust less; for it is plain, as the author shows,

that the first was the real inventor of the divine art, and the last, aided by his wealth and legal injustice, deprived him of the benefits, and for a time of the reputation, of his great discovery.

And he will learn, also, what is not so well known, that Gutenberg's success was largely due to his devoted wife, Anna. But for her faithful affection and constant encouragement, he would have faltered and failed under so many difficulties, oppositions, lawsuits, treacheries and perils. But sustained by her cheerful consolations and her ever-hopeful sympathies, he pressed on, overcame all obstacles, and finally triumphed — even the traitor Schœffer acknowledging that though his enemies might rob Gutenberg of his types and press and books, they could not rob him of his genius and fame.

In addition to the story of Gutenberg, the author has given us a brief but interesting sketch of the progress of the art to the present time, including all the branches of printing, stereotyping and book-making.

4. Stories and Pictures from Church History. For Young People. Illustrated. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. $1.25.

Witch Hill: A History of Salem Witchcraft. Including Illustrative Sketches of Persons and Places. By Rev. Z. A. Mudge. Carlton & Lanahan. $1.25.

Memoir of Washington Irving. With Selections from his Works, and Criticisms. By Charles Adams, D. D. Carlton & Lanahan. $1.25.

Here are three volumes, attractive in look, and doubly attractive in the matter of their contents. Certainly our Methodist brethren are doing a good work for Home and Sunday School libraries by the preparation of such books; which, while they do not ignore the religious thought and feeling of their authors, do not on the other hand offensively thrust into the face of the reader the peculiarities of their theology.

"Witch Hill" is by the author of "Views from Plymouth Rock," which we heartily commended on its appearance a year ago, or more. It is beautifully gotten up, and tells the story of that sad tragedy from authentic sources, and is not only suitable for young people, but will answer as a substitute with those who cannot afford the costly work of Upham. The "Stories from Church History," written in an excellent spirit, is an exceedingly pleasing account of the leading persons and events in the history of the church from the first to the fourteenth century. Parents and Sunday School Library Committees should secure this volume. "Washington Irving" is a brief but reliable record of a literary genius whose works are delight and instruction to all who read the English language.

5. American Religion. By John Weiss. Roberts Brothers. $1.50.

One of those oracular books which are the fruitage only of centuries of growth and development. Reading it affects us, like a sultry day in August, with a sense of suffocation; for after a few pages we are obliged to lay it down, and struggle for breath. Æronauts, ascending to great heights, do not perceive the inequalities of the

earth's surface; hill and valley blending into one level plain — *though the inequalities really exist.* Mr. Weiss has risen so high in his theological balloon that he sees all religions in the same way. Christianity, Brahminism, Buddhism, the Mythologies of Greece and Rome, are all on the same level to him; and he feels the most profound compassion for all those who, being in the neighborhood of the earth, insist that there *is* a difference. Still, we agree with the opinion evidently entertained by Mr. Weiss, that there is some "fine writing" in the book — though we have grave doubts as to whether America will improve its present "opportunity," and, repudiating the New Testament, adopt Mr. Weiss's book as a new and higher revelation.

From the above we except the chapter on the "American Soldier" — would that it were all of this sort — but was it Peter or Paul who was "a tent-maker"? Matthew, who knew Peter well, says he was a fisherman; but this of course is not to be set against the results of Mr. Weiss's exhaustive studies on the subject.

6. The Silent Partner. By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, author of "The Gates Ajar," etc. James R. Osgood & Co. $1.50.

It has the fault of most books of this kind in selecting extreme examples of suffering and degradation, exaggerated at that, and treating them as if they were the rule, instead of the exception. One might as well single out General Banks as an example of the advantages of early life in the Mills, and attempt to show from his case the kind of men at work in them. Such statements are one-sided and substantially untrue.

We lived nearly twenty years in "Five Falls," and though there were some cases where the corporations, or rather the agents, were unjust, overbearing, influenced by political and religious prejudice in discharging workmen; and though there were combinations among corporations to prevent those leaving contrary to the rules from obtaining work again; and though there were some cases of great poverty and suffering and depravity among the operative population, we are sure that those who take this book as a true picture of the past or present character and condition of the operatives, of the mills and boarding-houses, will be misled. The working population has undoubtedly greatly deteriorated since the days of the "Lowell Offering," but there has been a change for the better in the boarding-houses, and in the ventilation, surroundings, and sanitary conditions of the mills.

As to the plot and aim of the work, it is in fact but a repetition of the story of "George MacDonald" and kindred books — an earnest Christian young man or woman refusing the ease and luxuries of wealth, and devoting themselves and their fortunes to the melioration of the condition of the suffering, ignorant and dangerous classes. The close of the story is abrupt and unsatisfactory — in fact, the book is a failure.

7. Over the Ocean; or, Sights and Scenes in Foreign Lands. By Curtis Guild, Editor of the Boston Commercial Bulletin. Lee & Shepard. $2.50.

Among the multitudes of books of travel, where the writers go over the same ground, it is impossible that anything very new or remarkable can be found. The only difference is the difference of eyes in seeing, and the difference of style in describing, the same peoples, places and things. In the faculty of sight, and in his attractive way of picturing what he sees to his readers, Mr. Guild is to be counted as fortunate. He has a pleasant, gossipping way of talking over his adventures; but, while amusing, he never fails to inform, to show you everything worth seeing, and tell you everything worth knowing. But how could he be so near Rome, Naples, Vesuvius and Pompeii, and not visit them? One who can describe so admirably the palaces of Paris, the streets of London, Westminster Abbey, the Galleries of Art, Milan, Venice, the Alps, and the Lakes of Italy, should have seen these places, and given us pictures of them.

8. The Revelation of John; with Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Practical, designed for both Pastors and People. By Rev, Henry Cowles, D. D. D. Appleton & Co. $1.50.

This is a valuable contribution toward the true interpretation of the Apocalypse. It takes the ground in regard to the early date of the book, before the fall of Jerusalem, which Universalists have always occupied, and sustains the position by an able and unanswerable argument drawn from internal and external evidence. The "Introduction," of fifty pages, is an admirable piece of Biblical criticism, in which the Bible is allowed to be its own interpreter. It is refreshing to read such honest and manly statement from such a source; and we feel sure that it must enlighten many minds whom our arguments have never reached.

As an example of the author's candor we give the following on that often-quoted and falsely-applied passage in chapter xvii.: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still," etc.:

"The passage has been supposed by some to teach that death fixes the character, and therefore the destiny, of all men, bad or good, unchangeably. All I feel authorized to say as to the bearing of the passage upon this doctrine is that it seems to *assume* that the wicked men here thought of (the persecutors and idolaters who figure prominently in this book) will persist in their iniquity, and therefore will meet their just doom. But the precise point *asserted* and the argument made must be construed as above — the demands of the context requiring this. The 'coming' contemplated in verse 12 is manifestly the retribution predicted in this book upon corrupt Judaism and idolatrous Paganism, both of which at the date of this book were historically near — the retribution of both righteous and wicked *is close at hand.*"

9. Rome and Italy at the Opening of the Œcumenical Council, depicted in Twelve Letters written from Rome to a Gentleman in America. By Edmond De Pressense, D. D., Pastor of the Evangelical Church in Paris. Translated by Rev. George Prentice, A. M. Carlton & Lanahan. $1.50.

The author of this work is too well known in America by his "Life and Work of Christ," and "History of the First Three Cen-

turies of the Christian Church," to make it needful for us to recommend the perusal of anything from his facile and graceful pen. This volume is a brilliant sketch, rather than a history, of the Great Council which committed the insane folly of voting a feeble and bigoted old man infallible. It is thoroughly French in style, lively, picturesque, piquant, enabling the reader to see with the author's eyes, and to enjoy the stir and animation of the various scenes in that pitiful ecclesiastical farce. Unfortunately, however, the record is unfinished, stopping at the point where the action becomes most interesting. However, we are partly compensated for this by valuable information respecting the excavations by Louis Napoleon among the palaces of the Cæsars on the Palatine Hill, the Catacombs and early Christian Burials, and the more recent discoveries at Pompeii. To us the Letters giving these particulars are the most attractive portion of the book.

Our readers will remember that at the close of his Epistle to the Philippians, Paul, then a prisoner at Rome, says, "All the saints salute you, chiefly *they that are of Cæsar's household.*" How singularly is this fact of converts in the emperor's household confirmed by the following recent discovery:

"Strange fact! among the ruins of the imperial palace certain Christian memorials have been found belonging to the early ages of the Church; among the rest, one of those little funeral lamps, adorned with evangelical symbols, which were carried among Catacombs. This need not astonish us, for St. Paul tells us that his bonds had become known in the Pretorium, and even in Cæsar's palace. Thus while the persecuting emperor fancied he had annihilated an odious sect by his cruelty, it was growing up in his own palace, and with a moral power which was to overturn the world."

10. A Manual of Ancient History, from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire. Comprising the History of Chaldea, Assyria, Media, Babylonia, Lydia, Phœnicia, Syria, Judea, Egypt, Carthage, Persia, Greece, Macedonia, Parthia, and Rome. By George Rawlinson. Harper & Brothers.

The title is ample information regarding the ground which this book is intended to cover; and that it is by the editor of the "History of Herodotus" and the author of "Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records," one of the most able and convincing books ever written on the subject, is a sufficient guaranty to our readers that it is thorough, reliable, up to the level of our present advanced knowledge, and embodying all the really ascertained results of modern research and discovery. It is beyond comparison the best manual of Ancient History which modern scholarship has produced, and will prove as convenient to the student as it will be instructive in schools and families, and attractive to the general reader.

11. The Mutineers of the Bounty and their Descendants in Pitcairn and Norfolk Islands. By Lady Beecher. With Map and Illustrations. Harper & Brothers. $1.50.

We shall never forget the interest and excitement with which, when a boy, we read Lieut. Bligh's Narrative of the Bounty Mutiny; nor the indignation we felt against the Mutineers. That was one side of the story — this book is the other; and having read it, our

indignation has changed sides. When, twenty years after the sad event, in 1808, Capt. Folger of the American ship Topaz, landed at Pitcairn, and made the astounding discovery that it was inhabited by the descendants of the mutineers, who under the instruction of Adams, the only survivor, had become a happy, virtuous, Christian community, and made the island a physical and moral Eden, it at once became famous throughout the Christian world.

The narrative, as such, is remarkably pleasing, but it has for us an additional interest as an illustration of the providential manner in which evil finally shapes itself into some form of good. We fully agree with the "Literary World," which says that,

"The history of the Pitcairn Colony proves that there is 'good in everything'; that man, however depraved, under certain circumstances may be trained into moral strength and beauty; that, indeed, grapes may come of thistles. The story of the 'Mutineers of the Bounty' will arouse grave thoughts in those minds which occupy themselves with the problems of life and society. There never was, and probably there never will be, so fair an opportunity of noting the operations of human nature when isolated from social influences, as is afforded in the experience of the Pitcairn Island Colony. Most readers will value the book for its exciting interest and freshness; but a few will look upon it as the record of an extremely interesting experiment in social science."

12. The Life and Letters of Hugh Miller. By Peter Bayne. 2 vols. Gould & Lincoln. $4.00.

This long-looked-for work is at last out, and though somewhat diffuse, and unnecessarily minute in its details, is nevertheless a noble tribute to the memory of a great and good man, by one equally qualified by his ability, his friendship for him, and his cordial appreciation of his character, to tell the story of his life. And such a life! such a struggle against poverty, hardships, iron difficulties in childhood and youth, such a resolute will to conquer and the steady upward progress consequent upon it, such growth and use of his intellectual powers, such compelling respect and confidence from the learned and influential, and finally, such splendid triumphs in science and literature — and then, alas! the wreck of the overworked brain, madness, and suicide, as the tragical end of this grand life — Oh, what lessons there are for us all in this; lessons fraught with encouragement, inspiration and warning!

No young man with literary ambitions, or longings for scientific culture and investigation, after reading these volumes, need despair or complain of being hindered and cramped, and shut out from study and reputation, by want of opportunities and means and friends. This brave Stone-mason will teach him how to command opportunities, and create means, and win friends. At the same time his mournful death, and as well that of his countryman, Walter Scott, will warn all those who are overtasking the weary and complaining brain, that there is a limit beyond which it is not safe to drive it, lest it turn again and rend them.

Hugh Miller was one of the true heroes of our age, lifting himself from obscurity to eminence by force of his genius, and by unre-

mitting toil. Since Benjamin Franklin there has been no finer example of a self-made man, with character fully rounded and free alike from vanity and dogmatism.

13. The Journal of John Woolman. With an Introduction by John G. Whittier. J. R. Osgood & Co. $1.50.

One of the most delicious chapters of autobiography ever written — the record of as sweet a life, as conscientious, as loving and Christian, as has ever been lived on the earth this side of Saint John. Those who read it will not wonder that Channing pronounced it "beyond comparison the sweetest and purest autobiography in the language," and that Charles Lamb advised his friend to "get the writings of John Woolman by heart." The fifty pages of Introduction by Whittier — and that he should write them is sufficient commendation of the book — is freighted equally with important historical matter and inspiring sentiment. The reader will find some new information touching the early movement of the Friends against the practice of holding slaves. The tenderness of feeling, the sensitive conscience, with which John Woolman began his protest against it, makes one of the most charming passages of his record.

14. On the Genesis of Species. By St. George Mivart, F. R. S. D. Appleton & Co. $1.50.

The learned author shows himself well fitted to measure swords with Darwin; and, while he acknowledges his great services to science, and his own inclinations at first toward the doctrine of Natural Selection, points out how a closer examination of the theory of man's descent has discovered to him insuperable difficulties and objections in its way. He does not deny that the law of natural selection prevails to some extent; but it is not supreme, it is not an explanation of manifold organic phenomena, it is a subordinate and secondary agency. There is behind and above this a higher power, a sustaining and directing force "underlying the whole of Nature, organic and inorganic, cosmical, physical, chemical, terrestrial, vital and social," acting on "every part of every individual, and of every organism as a unit, and of the entire organic world as a whole." The closing chapter on "Theology and Evolution" is especially deserving attention as a calm, candid and learned discussion of the questions in controversy. The principal points made by the author are the following:

"That natural selection is incompetent to account for the incipient stages of useful structures.

That it does not harmonize with the co-existence of closely similar structures of diverse origin.

That there are grounds for thinking that specific differences may be developed suddenly instead of gradually.

That the opinion that species have definite though very different limits to their variability is still tenable.

That certain fossil transitional forms are absent, which might have been expected to be present.

That some facts of geographical distribution supplement other difficulties.

That the objection drawn from the physiological difference between species and races still exists unrefuted.

That there are many remarkable phenomena in organic forms upon which natural selection throws no light whatever, but the explanations of which, if they could be attained, might throw light upon specific origination."

15. Little Men: Life at Plumfield with Jo's Boys. By Louisa M. Alcott. Roberts Brothers.

Where is the need of writing a commendatory notice of a book which has twenty-seven thousand copies ordered before any one, save the author and proof-reader, has seen a line of it? Where is the need of saying to our readers that they will find pleasant entertainment, and many profitable suggestions regarding the management of "the small peoples," by the author of "Little Women"? So fresh, so human, so genial and healthy in spirit, so alive with useful hints, so like the life of a beautiful June day — these are the books for all classes of readers from the youngest to the oldest. Give them place in every household, as blessings alike to parents and children.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Duel between France and Germany, with its Lesson to Civilization. Lecture by Charles Sumner. Lee & Shepard.

Arts of Intoxication — the Aim and Results. By Rev. T. J. Crane, D. D. Carlton & Lanahan. $1.25. [A volume of facts regarding intoxicating agencies which will prove very useful to Temperance Lecturers, Editors, Preachers, and all persons engaged in this reform. It is history, and argument, and revelation touching the use and effects of Opium, Hasheesh, Tobacco, Alcohol, etc.; all in narrative style, animated and dramatic.]

The Causation, Course and Treatment of Reflex Insanity in Women. By Horatio R. Storer, M. D., LL. B., of Boston. Lee & Shepard. [Dr. Storer has accumulated a fund of important facts to show that a reform is needed in the treatment of insanity among women, growing out of the fact that their insanity so often results from causes peculiar to the sex. It is a work demanding the profound attention of physicians and superintendents of Insane Asylums.]

The Fight in Dame Europa's School; showing how the German Boy thrashed the French Boy, and how the English Boy looked on. Charles H. Spencer. 25 cents. [200,000 copies sold in England.]

Gould & Lincoln's Annual of Scientific Discovery; and Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art for 1871. $2.00. [We gave the full title of this volume in our last, and we call attention to it again as being one of the most valuable issues of the day for those who wish to keep posted in regard to recent discoveries in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Geology, Chemistry, Astronomy, Biology, Archæology, etc. It is a complete *resume* of all that is new in these departments of activity and knowledge; and for any town or school or public library of any sort to be without the entire series, is a reproach to those having the matter in charge.]

Three Sermons suggested by the Death of Rev. Albert Barnes, preached in the Church of the Messiah, Philadelphia, by Rev. E. G. Brooks, D. D., Pastor. [Sermons

which ought to be repeated before every Orthodox congregation in the land. They are chiefly based on Mr. Barnes' confession of his mental anguish and torture consequent upon belief in endless punishment.]

Historical Account of the Little Sisters of the Poor. Translated from the French of M. Leon Aubineau. Sold for the benefit of the House of the Little Sisters. Boston: Patrick Donahoe. [A pleasing, surprising and inspiring record of one of the beneficent Catholic charities of the poor among the poor.]

New Testament Text-Book: Embracing an Historical Tabular View of the Gospels; Tables of the Parables; Discourses and Miracles of Christ; Predictions in the Old Testament, with their Fulfilment in the New; Classification of the Books of the New Testament, with Observations on each; Biographical Sketches; Descriptions of Places; and an important Chronological Table. With Maps showing the Journeys of Jesus and St. Paul, etc., etc. Compiled from the works of eminent Biblical writers, by Stephen Hawes, author of "Synchronology of Sacred and Profane History." 75 cts. [The title is a sufficient exhibition of the intent and use of this volume. But the author does not seem settled on some points. As an example, in the Synchronology, beginning on page 143, he assigns 1st and 2d Timothy to A. D. 59, *during Paul's journey to Macedonia;* but on pages 40 and 41, speaking of these epistles, he says Paul wrote them *while in prison*, being his second imprisonment, and ending in his death, which according to his Synchronology occurred in A. D. 67.]

The Wonders of the Heavens. By Camille Hammarion. With Forty-eight Illustrations. Charles Scribner & Co. $1.50. [The best volume of the best series of books for popular reading ever issued in this country.]

Musings over the "Christian Year" and "Lyra Innocentium," by Charlotte Mary Yonge; Together with a few Gleanings of Recollections of the Rev. John Kemble, gathered by several Friends. D. Appleton & Co. $2.50.

The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ, and its Relation to the Principles and Practice of Christianity. By William Stroud, M. D. With a Letter on the Subject by Sir James Y. Simpson, Bart., M. D. D. Appleton & Co. $2.00. [A work showing much thought, a critical study of the Scriptures, curious learning, elaborate argument, and professional knowledge; all of which is compelled to the service of monstrous theological errors. Much rare and interesting matter is gathered into the "Notes and Illustrations."]

Public and Parlor Readings: Prose and Poetry for the use of Reading Clubs and for Public and Social Entertainment. *Humorous.* Edited by Lewis B. Monroe. Boston: Lee & Shepard. $1.50. [One of the great wants of our American life is recreation; not public recreation altogether, but amusement for the *Home* circle, in which all, young and old, shall have part. The truth is, in a multitude of cases, all the sweetness and beauty and blessedness of home are swallowed up in the rush of business and public amusements, or in professional studies and labors. Parents, Children, take a word of advice — seek to make Home more attractive and pleasant. One way of doing this is reading aloud; and here you have a collection of pieces admirably adapted to the purpose. As a relief from the cares of business, as a substitute for dangerous pleasures, as a means of cheering the aged and infirm, and making the evenings pass agreeably and profitably, nothing better can be found than this volume of Prof. Monroe.]

Wonders of European Art. By Louis Viardot. Illustrated with Eleven Wood Engravings. Charles Scribner & Co.

Leisure Hour Series. Around a Spring. By Gustave Droz. New York: Holt & Williams.

Ten Great Religions: An Essay in Comparative Theology. By James Freeman Clarke. J. R. Osgood & Co. $3.00. [Reserved for notice in our next issue.]

Marquis and Merchant. A Novel. By Mortimer Collins. D. Appleton & Co. 50 cents.

The Posthumous Papers of The Pickwick Club. By Charles Dickens. Illustrated. D. Appleton & Co. 75 cents. [A new, cheap, and outwardly beautiful edition of the works of this marvellous genius.]

Reminiscences of Fifty Years. By Mark Boyd. D. Appleton & Co. $1.75. [Pleasant anecdotes of Wellington, Palmerston, Brougham, Sir John Franklin, Sir John Ross, Rogers, Campbell, Thackeray, etc.]

Article XVI.

Free Religion in the West.

The first annual meeting of "The Free Religious Association" was held in Boston, May 28th and 29th, 1868. The movement would seem to have been precipitated by the formation of the "National Conference of Unitarian Churches" at New York, in April, 1865. At this and the subsequent Unitarian National Conference, held in Syracuse, October, 1866, a vigorous attempt was made by a small number of radical clergymen to expunge from the "Preamble" the words, "The Lord Jesus Christ"; and virtually to place the Conference on the same basis as the various philanthropic Associations that only propose the general moral and religious improvement of society. This attempt encountered a signal failure; indeed, its only importance consisted in the recognized ability and character of a few of the young clergymen identified with it. The leading spirits in the effort now "changed their base" and formed the "Free Religious Association," becoming themselves the permanent officers of the organization. The operations of this Association seem to have been confined to the usual Convention, on Anniversary Week — an assembly that now occupies the unique place in the "May Meetings" formerly held by the Garrisonian Anti-Slavery gatherings. It maintains "an open platform" where a variety of people attempt to "free their minds" on a very miscellaneous range of moral and religious topics. We have not learned that anything beyond this has been proposed in the way of organization. Its chief influence has been wielded through the publication of its yearly proceedings, and the "Radical" magazine and "Index" journal which, in a certain irresponsible way, represent its tendencies.

Indeed, to a superficial observer this Association would appear to be nothing but a chance yearly gathering of people to express in public their discontent with human affairs in general. The speeches of its orators are filled with vigorous

earth's surface; hill and valley blending into one level plain — *though the inequalities really exist.* Mr. Weiss has risen so high in his theological balloon that he sees all religions in the same way. Christianity, Brahminism, Buddhism, the Mythologies of Greece and Rome, are all on the same level to him; and he feels the most profound compassion for all those who, being in the neighborhood of the earth, insist that there *is* a difference. Still, we agree with the opinion evidently entertained by Mr. Weiss, that there is some "fine writing" in the book — though we have grave doubts as to whether America will improve its present "opportunity," and, repudiating the New Testament, adopt Mr. Weiss's book as a new and higher revelation.

From the above we except the chapter on the "American Soldier" — would that it were all of this sort — but was it Peter or Paul who was "a tent-maker"? Matthew, who knew Peter well, says he was a fisherman; but this of course is not to be set against the results of Mr. Weiss's exhaustive studies on the subject.

6. The Silent Partner. By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, author of "The Gates Ajar," etc. James R. Osgood & Co. $1.50.

It has the fault of most books of this kind in selecting extreme examples of suffering and degradation, exaggerated at that, and treating them as if they were the rule, instead of the exception. One might as well single out General Banks as an example of the advantages of early life in the Mills, and attempt to show from his case the kind of men at work in them. Such statements are one-sided and substantially untrue.

We lived nearly twenty years in "Five Falls," and though there were some cases where the corporations, or rather the agents, were unjust, overbearing, influenced by political and religious prejudice in discharging workmen; and though there were combinations among corporations to prevent those leaving contrary to the rules from obtaining work again; and though there were some cases of great poverty and suffering and depravity among the operative population, we are sure that those who take this book as a true picture of the past or present character and condition of the operatives, of the mills and boarding-houses, will be misled. The working population has undoubtedly greatly deteriorated since the days of the "Lowell Offering," but there has been a change for the better in the boarding-houses, and in the ventilation, surroundings, and sanitary conditions of the mills.

As to the plot and aim of the work, it is in fact but a repetition of the story of "George MacDonald" and kindred books — an earnest Christian young man or woman refusing the ease and luxuries of wealth, and devoting themselves and their fortunes to the melioration of the condition of the suffering, ignorant and dangerous classes. The close of the story is abrupt and unsatisfactory — in fact, the book is a failure.

7. Over the Ocean; or, Sights and Scenes in Foreign Lands. By Curtis Guild, Editor of the Boston Commercial Bulletin. Lee & Shepard. $2.50.

Among the multitudes of books of travel, where the writers go over the same ground, it is impossible that anything very new or remarkable can be found. The only difference is the difference of eyes in seeing, and the difference of style in describing, the same peoples, places and things. In the faculty of sight, and in his attractive way of picturing what he sees to his readers, Mr. Guild is to be counted as fortunate. He has a pleasant, gossipping way of talking over his adventures; but, while amusing, he never fails to inform, to show you everything worth seeing, and tell you everything worth knowing. But how could he be so near Rome, Naples, Vesuvius and Pompeii, and not visit them? One who can describe so admirably the palaces of Paris, the streets of London, Westminster Abbey, the Galleries of Art, Milan, Venice, the Alps, and the Lakes of Italy, should have seen these places, and given us pictures of them.

8. The Revelation of John; with Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Practical, designed for both Pastors and People. By Rev, Henry Cowles, D. D. D. Appleton & Co. $1.50.

This is a valuable contribution toward the true interpretation of the Apocalypse. It takes the ground in regard to the early date of the book, before the fall of Jerusalem, which Universalists have always occupied, and sustains the position by an able and unanswerable argument drawn from internal and external evidence. The "Introduction," of fifty pages, is an admirable piece of Biblical criticism, in which the Bible is allowed to be its own interpreter. It is refreshing to read such honest and manly statement from such a source; and we feel sure that it must enlighten many minds whom our arguments have never reached.

As an example of the author's candor we give the following on that often-quoted and falsely-applied passage in chapter xvii.: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still," etc.:

"The passage has been supposed by some to teach that death fixes the character, and therefore the destiny, of all men, bad or good, unchangeably. All I feel authorized to say as to the bearing of the passage upon this doctrine is that it seems to *assume* that the wicked men here thought of (the persecutors and idolaters who figure prominently in this book) will persist in their iniquity, and therefore will meet their just doom. But the precise point *asserted* and the argument made must be construed as above — the demands of the context requiring this. The 'coming' contemplated in verse 12 is manifestly the retribution predicted in this book upon corrupt Judaism and idolatrous Paganism, both of which at the date of this book were historically near — the retribution of both righteous and wicked *is close at hand.*"

9. Rome and Italy at the Opening of the Œcumenical Council, depicted in Twelve Letters written from Rome to a Gentleman in America. By Edmond De Pressense, D. D., Pastor of the Evangelical Church in Paris. Translated by Rev. George Prentice, A. M. Carlton & Lanahan. $1.50.

The author of this work is too well known in America by his "Life and Work of Christ," and "History of the First Three Cen-

turies of the Christian Church," to make it needful for us to recommend the perusal of anything from his facile and graceful pen. This volume is a brilliant sketch, rather than a history, of the Great Council which committed the insane folly of voting a feeble and bigoted old man infallible. It is thoroughly French in style, lively, picturesque, piquant, enabling the reader to see with the author's eyes, and to enjoy the stir and animation of the various scenes in that pitiful ecclesiastical farce. Unfortunately, however, the record is unfinished, stopping at the point where the action becomes most interesting. However, we are partly compensated for this by valuable information respecting the excavations by Louis Napoleon among the palaces of the Cæsars on the Palatine Hill, the Catacombs and early Christian Burials, and the more recent discoveries at Pompeii. To us the Letters giving these particulars are the most attractive portion of the book.

Our readers will remember that at the close of his Epistle to the Philippians, Paul, then a prisoner at Rome, says, "All the saints salute you, chiefly *they that are of Cæsar's household.*" How singularly is this fact of converts in the emperor's household confirmed by the following recent discovery:

"Strange fact! among the ruins of the imperial palace certain Christian memorials have been found belonging to the early ages of the Church; among the rest, one of those little funeral lamps, adorned with evangelical symbols, which were carried among Catacombs. This need not astonish us, for St. Paul tells us that his bonds had become known in the Pretorium, and even in Cæsar's palace. Thus while the persecuting emperor fancied he had annihilated an odious sect by his cruelty, it was growing up in his own palace, and with a moral power which was to overturn the world."

10. A Manual of Ancient History, from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire. Comprising the History of Chaldea, Assyria, Media, Babylonia, Lydia, Phœnicia, Syria, Judea, Egypt, Carthage, Persia, Greece, Macedonia, Parthia, and Rome. By George Rawlinson. Harper & Brothers.

The title is ample information regarding the ground which this book is intended to cover; and that it is by the editor of the "History of Herodotus" and the author of "Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records," one of the most able and convincing books ever written on the subject, is a sufficient guaranty to our readers that it is thorough, reliable, up to the level of our present advanced knowledge, and embodying all the really ascertained results of modern research and discovery. It is beyond comparison the best manual of Ancient History which modern scholarship has produced, and will prove as convenient to the student as it will be instructive in schools and families, and attractive to the general reader.

11. The Mutineers of the Bounty and their Descendants in Pitcairn and Norfolk Islands. By Lady Beecher. With Map and Illustrations. Harper & Brothers. $1.50.

We shall never forget the interest and excitement with which, when a boy, we read Lieut. Bligh's Narrative of the Bounty Mutiny; nor the indignation we felt against the Mutineers. That was one side of the story — this book is the other; and having read it, our

indignation has changed sides. When, twenty years after the sad event, in 1808, Capt. Folger of the American ship Topaz, landed at Pitcairn, and made the astounding discovery that it was inhabited by the descendants of the mutineers, who under the instruction of Adams, the only survivor, had become a happy, virtuous, Christian community, and made the island a physical and moral Eden, it at once became famous throughout the Christian world.

The narrative, as such, is remarkably pleasing, but it has for us an additional interest as an illustration of the providential manner in which evil finally shapes itself into some form of good. We fully agree with the "Literary World," which says that,

"The history of the Pitcairn Colony proves that there is 'good in everything'; that man, however depraved, under certain circumstances may be trained into moral strength and beauty; that, indeed, grapes may come of thistles. The story of the 'Mutineers of the Bounty' will arouse grave thoughts in those minds which occupy themselves with the problems of life and society. There never was, and probably there never will be, so fair an opportunity of noting the operations of human nature when isolated from social influences, as is afforded in the experience of the Pitcairn Island Colony. Most readers will value the book for its exciting interest and freshness; but a few will look upon it as the record of an extremely interesting experiment in social science."

12. The Life and Letters of Hugh Miller. By Peter Bayne. 2 vols. Gould & Lincoln. $4.00.

This long-looked-for work is at last out, and though somewhat diffuse, and unnecessarily minute in its details, is nevertheless a noble tribute to the memory of a great and good man, by one equally qualified by his ability, his friendship for him, and his cordial appreciation of his character, to tell the story of his life. And such a life! such a struggle against poverty, hardships, iron difficulties in childhood and youth, such a resolute will to conquer and the steady upward progress consequent upon it, such growth and use of his intellectual powers, such compelling respect and confidence from the learned and influential, and finally, such splendid triumphs in science and literature — and then, alas! the wreck of the overworked brain, madness, and suicide, as the tragical end of this grand life — Oh, what lessons there are for us all in this; lessons fraught with encouragement, inspiration and warning!

No young man with literary ambitions, or longings for scientific culture and investigation, after reading these volumes, need despair or complain of being hindered and cramped, and shut out from study and reputation, by want of opportunities and means and friends. This brave Stone-mason will teach him how to command opportunities, and create means, and win friends. At the same time his mournful death, and as well that of his countryman, Walter Scott, will warn all those who are overtasking the weary and complaining brain, that there is a limit beyond which it is not safe to drive it, lest it turn again and rend them.

Hugh Miller was one of the true heroes of our age, lifting himself from obscurity to eminence by force of his genius, and by unre-

mitting toil. Since Benjamin Franklin there has been no finer example of a self-made man, with character fully rounded and free alike from vanity and dogmatism.

13. The Journal of John Woolman. With an Introduction by John G. Whittier. J. R. Osgood & Co. $1.50.

One of the most delicious chapters of autobiography ever written — the record of as sweet a life, as conscientious, as loving and Christian, as has ever been lived on the earth this side of Saint John. Those who read it will not wonder that Channing pronounced it "beyond comparison the sweetest and purest autobiography in the language," and that Charles Lamb advised his friend to "get the writings of John Woolman by heart." The fifty pages of Introduction by Whittier — and that he should write them is sufficient commendation of the book — is freighted equally with important historical matter and inspiring sentiment. The reader will find some new information touching the early movement of the Friends against the practice of holding slaves. The tenderness of feeling, the sensitive conscience, with which John Woolman began his protest against it, makes one of the most charming passages of his record.

14. On the Genesis of Species. By St. George Mivart, F. R. S. D. Appleton & Co. $1.50.

The learned author shows himself well fitted to measure swords with Darwin; and, while he acknowledges his great services to science, and his own inclinations at first toward the doctrine of Natural Selection, points out how a closer examination of the theory of man's descent has discovered to him insuperable difficulties and objections in its way. He does not deny that the law of natural selection prevails to some extent; but it is not supreme, it is not an explanation of manifold organic phenomena, it is a subordinate and secondary agency. There is behind and above this a higher power, a sustaining and directing force "underlying the whole of Nature, organic and inorganic, cosmical, physical, chemical, terrestrial, vital and social," acting on "every part of every individual, and of every organism as a unit, and of the entire organic world as a whole." The closing chapter on "Theology and Evolution" is especially deserving attention as a calm, candid and learned discussion of the questions in controversy. The principal points made by the author are the following:

"That natural selection is incompetent to account for the incipient stages of useful structures.

That it does not harmonize with the co-existence of closely similar structures of diverse origin.

That there are grounds for thinking that specific differences may be developed suddenly instead of gradually.

That the opinion that species have definite though very different limits to their variability is still tenable.

That certain fossil transitional forms are absent, which might have been expected to be present.

That some facts of geographical distribution supplement other difficulties.

That the objection drawn from the physiological difference between species and races still exists unrefuted.

That there are many remarkable phenomena in organic forms upon which natural selection throws no light whatever, but the explanations of which, if they could be attained, might throw light upon specific origination."

15. Little Men: Life at Plumfield with Jo's Boys. By Louisa M. Alcott. Roberts Brothers.

Where is the need of writing a commendatory notice of a book which has twenty-seven thousand copies ordered before any one, save the author and proof-reader, has seen a line of it? Where is the need of saying to our readers that they will find pleasant entertainment, and many profitable suggestions regarding the management of "the small peoples," by the author of "Little Women"? So fresh, so human, so genial and healthy in spirit, so alive with useful hints, so like the life of a beautiful June day — these are the books for all classes of readers from the youngest to the oldest. Give them place in every household, as blessings alike to parents and children.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Duel between France and Germany, with its Lesson to Civilization. Lecture by Charles Sumner. Lee & Shepard.

Arts of Intoxication — the Aim and Results. By Rev. T. J. Crane, D. D. Carlton & Lanahan. $1.25. [A volume of facts regarding intoxicating agencies which will prove very useful to Temperance Lecturers, Editors, Preachers, and all persons engaged in this reform. It is history, and argument, and revelation touching the use and effects of Opium, Hasheesh, Tobacco, Alcohol, etc.; all in narrative style, animated and dramatic.]

The Causation, Course and Treatment of Reflex Insanity in Women. By Horatio R. Storer, M. D., LL. B., of Boston. Lee & Shepard. [Dr. Storer has accumulated a fund of important facts to show that a reform is needed in the treatment of insanity among women, growing out of the fact that their insanity so often results from causes peculiar to the sex. It is a work demanding the profound attention of physicians and superintendents of Insane Asylums.]

The Fight in Dame Europa's School; showing how the German Boy thrashed the French Boy, and how the English Boy looked on. Charles H. Spencer. 25 cents. [200,000 copies sold in England.]

Gould & Lincoln's Annual of Scientific Discovery; and Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art for 1871. $2.00. [We gave the full title of this volume in our last, and we call attention to it again as being one of the most valuable issues of the day for those who wish to keep posted in regard to recent discoveries in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Geology, Chemistry, Astronomy, Biology, Archæology, etc. It is a complete *resume* of all that is new in these departments of activity and knowledge; and for any town or school or public library of any sort to be without the entire series, is a reproach to those having the matter in charge.]

Three Sermons suggested by the Death of Rev. Albert Barnes, preached in the Church of the Messiah, Philadelphia, by Rev. E. G. Brooks, D. D., Pastor. [Sermons

which ought to be repeated before every Orthodox congregation in the land. They are evidently based on Mr. Barnes' confession of his mental anguish and torture consequent upon belief in endless punishment.]

Historical Account of the Little Sisters of the Poor. Translated from the French of M. Leon Aubineau. Sold for the benefit of the House of the Little Sisters. Boston: Patrick Donahoe. [A pleasing, surprising and inspiring record of one of the beneficent Catholic charities of the poor among the poor.]

New Testament Text-Book: Embracing an Historical Tabular View of the Gospels; Tables of the Parables; Discourses and Miracles of Christ; Predictions in the Old Testament, with their Fulfilment in the New; Classification of the Books of the New Testament, with Observations on each; Biographical Sketches; Descriptions of Places; and an important Chronological Table. With Maps showing the Journeys of Jesus and St. Paul, etc., etc. Compiled from the works of eminent Biblical writers, by Stephen Hawes, author of "Synchronology of Sacred and Profane History." 75 cts. [The title is a sufficient exhibition of the intent and use of this volume. But the author does not seem settled on some points. As an example, in the Synchronology, beginning on page 143, he assigns 1st and 2d Timothy to A. D. 59, *during Paul's journey to Macedonia*; but on pages 40 and 41, speaking of these epistles, he says Paul wrote them *while in prison*, being his second imprisonment, and ending in his death, which according to his Synchronology occurred in A. D. 67.]

The Wonders of the Heavens. By Camille Hammarion. With Forty-eight Illustrations. Charles Scribner & Co. $1.50. [The best volume of the best series of books for popular reading ever issued in this country.]

Musings over the "Christian Year" and "Lyra Innocentium," by Charlotte Mary Yonge; Together with a few Gleanings of Recollections of the Rev. John Kemble, gathered by several Friends. D. Appleton & Co. $2.50.

The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ, and its Relation to the Principles and Practice of Christianity. By William Stroud, M. D. With a Letter on the Subject by Sir James Y. Simpson, Bart., M. D. D. Appleton & Co. $2.00. [A work showing much thought, a critical study of the Scriptures, curious learning, elaborate argument, and professional knowledge; all of which is compelled to the service of monstrous theological errors. Much rare and interesting matter is gathered into the "Notes and Illustrations."]

Public and Parlor Readings: Prose and Poetry for the use of Reading Clubs and for Public and Social Entertainment. *Humorous.* Edited by Lewis B. Monroe. Boston: Lee & Shepard. $1.50. [One of the great wants of our American life is recreation; not public recreation altogether, but amusement for the *Home* circle, in which all, young and old, shall have part. The truth is, in a multitude of cases, all the sweetness and beauty and blessedness of home are swallowed up in the rush of business and public amusements, or in professional studies and labors. Parents, Children, take a word of advice — seek to make Home more attractive and pleasant. One way of doing this is reading aloud; and here you have a collection of pieces admirably adapted to the purpose. As a relief from the cares of business, as a substitute for dangerous pleasures, as a means of cheering the aged and infirm, and making the evenings pass agreeably and profitably, nothing better can be found than this volume of Prof. Monroe.]

Wonders of European Art. By Louis Viardot. Illustrated with Eleven Wood Engravings. Charles Scribner & Co.

Leisure Hour Series. Around a Spring. By Gustave Droz. New York: Holt & Williams.

Ten Great Religions: An Essay in Comparative Theology. By James Freeman Clarke. J. R. Osgood & Co. $3.00. [Reserved for notice in our next issue.]

Marquis and Merchant. A Novel. By Mortimer Collins. D. Appleton & Co. 50 cents.

The Posthumous Papers of The Pickwick Club. By Charles Dickens. Illustrated. D. Appleton & Co. 75 cents. [A new, cheap, and outwardly beautiful edition of the works of this marvellous genius.]

Reminiscences of Fifty Years. By Mark Boyd. D. Appleton & Co. $1.75. [Pleasant anecdotes of Wellington, Palmerston, Brougham, Sir John Franklin, Sir John Ross, Rogers, Campbell, Thackeray, etc.]

Article XVI.

Free Religion in the West.

The first annual meeting of "The Free Religious Association" was held in Boston, May 28th and 29th, 1868. The movement would seem to have been precipitated by the formation of the "National Conference of Unitarian Churches" at New York, in April, 1865. At this and the subsequent Unitarian National Conference, held in Syracuse, October, 1866, a vigorous attempt was made by a small number of radical clergymen to expunge from the "Preamble" the words, "The Lord Jesus Christ"; and virtually to place the Conference on the same basis as the various philanthropic Associations that only propose the general moral and religious improvement of society. This attempt encountered a signal failure; indeed, its only importance consisted in the recognized ability and character of a few of the young clergymen identified with it. The leading spirits in the effort now "changed their base" and formed the "Free Religious Association," becoming themselves the permanent officers of the organization. The operations of this Association seem to have been confined to the usual Convention, on Anniversary Week — an assembly that now occupies the unique place in the "May Meetings" formerly held by the Garrisonian Anti-Slavery gatherings. It maintains "an open platform" where a variety of people attempt to "free their minds" on a very miscellaneous range of moral and religious topics. We have not learned that anything beyond this has been proposed in the way of organization. Its chief influence has been wielded through the publication of its yearly proceedings, and the "Radical" magazine and "Index" journal which, in a certain irresponsible way, represent its tendencies.

Indeed, to a superficial observer this Association would appear to be nothing but a chance yearly gathering of people to express in public their discontent with human affairs in general. The speeches of its orators are filled with vigorous

protests against being held responsible for each other's views, or regarding their "Association" as even a rope of sand. The accomplished President, Rev. O. B. Frothingham, at one of its meetings in Cincinnati, last autumn, happily stated this feature of the movement: "*Our Creed is creedlessness, our Organization is disorganization.*" If we only looked at this Association from the outside, it would not claim the attention of serious thinkers; for the fact that discontented men and women, with a habit of uncontrolled expression, can entertain a brilliant assembly two days on Anniversary Week in Boston by a sharp criticism of the universe in general, does not signify a great deal. But every gathering of human beings that perpetuates itself has a soul as well as a body. Whatever such a crowd chooses to assert, it cannot hold together without some distinct central idea, unconsciously or consciously held by the moving spirits of the enterprise.

This central idea very early cropped out in the proceedings of the Free Religious Association. In the words, again, of its President, who certainly knows what he is about, "its basis is broader than anything before attempted in the way of organization in religious history. It goes below any one specific form of religion, and seeks to find the common ground on which all religions, or more properly religion itself, rests, and plants itself there. It contemplates the ultimate union, not simply of all sects in Christendom, but of all religions, Christian and non-Christian, in one. It looks beyond 'Christian' limits for its fellowship." "Its underlying principle is, that in this Association those various religious opinions and faiths meet and mingle *on perfectly equal terms.*" This declaration is fully supported by the whole subsequent drift of the Association. According to its written Constitution, its objects are "to promote the interests of pure religion, to encourage the scientific study of theology, and to increase fellowship in the spirit." But this very catholic purpose, as interpreted by its perpetual President and the drift of all its conventions, becomes an attempt to unite men on a common religious sentiment by the subversion of the Christian Reli-

gion. It does not matter on what foundation Christianity stands; whether on the Catholic basis of a perpetually inspired clerical body of infallible interpreters, or on the Protestant foundation of an actually and practically demonstrated superiority over all others; the Free Religious Association rejects its claim of authority or eminent superiority at the outset; makes a *tabula rasa* of all religions; seeks a "new departure" on the assumption that the whole field of religious inquiry is now just thrown open, and "scientific theology" must begin *de novo* and construct a religion by the individual intellectual powers.

We are aware that this assertion will be denied by many persons more or less identified with this movement; for very decided apostles of Christianity, Atheism, Spiritualism, Judaism, Shakerism, and other perfectly definite forms of faith have appeared on its platform. But it is not this which gives the real significance to this movement. Take any of those demonstrations out of the Convention, and it is not virtually impaired. But remove from the "Free Religious Association" this radical assumption that Christianity is neither by supernatural authority nor practical experiment the final religion of mankind, and its soul has departed, and the whole affair resolves itself into a May Day intellectual tournament for the entertainment of a Boston audience. It is to this point, therefore, that we shall direct our attention. If we would disperse a mist, we must dry up the stream from which it rises; if we would combat the "disorganization" called "Free Religion," we must direct our thoughts to this principle underlying both its Constitution and all its operations.

This organization of unbelief in Christianity is the logical result of tendencies that have long been at work in the theology of New England; developing there somewhat later than in Europe. The "Transcendental" school of Emerson and the "radical wing" of the Unitarian body have led in the movement; though it has been fed by numerous recruits from the Orthodox reäction and the social reformers. But, hitherto, it has confined itself to individual thinkers, litera-

ture, and a few independent congregations. The "Free Religious Association" and the "Radical Club," its offspring, are the crystallization of this tendency, and doubtless are destined to be the most formidable movement yet made among our native-born population to supersede Christianity. Previous to November, 1870, the West had known little of Free Religion as an organization. In every large city of the West there are associations of free-thinking Germans, a "Tom Paine Club," and a Sunday debating society of unbelievers in Christianity; but these are chiefly importations from European Radicalism, and attract little popular attention. Spiritualism is an established fact, also, among us; and our new country is swarming with people who are adrift in religious affairs. But the peculiar form of thought that culminated in Boston in May, 1868, has chiefly been represented among us by a few radical Unitarian ministers and their followers; Rev. M. D. Conway, formerly of Cincinnati, being their most brilliant leader. These men have succeeded in "disorganizing" several Unitarian churches; for several years kept the Western Unitarian Conference in hot water; and have always been, previous to the National Conference, a disturbing element in Unitarian missionary affairs. It was not till November, 1870, that the "Free Religious Association" appeared in the Western field as a body. In this month it held a series of Conventions in Cincinnati, Indianapolis and Toledo. Its President, Secretary, and several of its most pronounced Eastern advocates, were present — indeed, furnished the only novel feature of the occasion; since the few "old stagers" in atheism and scepticism of local celebrity, who took occasion to mount this platform and let off once more their monstrous tirades against the Christian Church and religion, were already well known to the floating audience of these communities. The "religious public" of these cities and the West, through the newspaper reports, was really attracted by this demonstration, and it was everywhere regarded as the presentation of a new Anti-Christian Religion, compounded in that laboratory of free thought, Boston,

and brought over the mountains to be tested by the life of the great West.

It must be confessed that the position assumed by those six "wise men from the East" in this series of "Free Religious Conventions" was somewhat startling. They came to the great West with the astounding message that the Christian Religion, the religion of the whole civilized world, is "passing away." Jesus Christ, according to them, was at best a "sweet youth," a "young Hebrew reformer," if indeed we know anything accurately about him. The popular faith in the Bible is "a superstition based on a dream." The "Christian Church is the great obstacle in the way of Free Religion"; is an organization of "thieves and murderers," metaphorically speaking. The "Coming Man" (including woman and child) "will not go to church," and some form of lecturing on "social ethics" may possibly supplant the church; indeed, one of the Western ministry brethren announces that his new church "would not be dedicated to God, but to Humanity." The President of the Convention said, "Another complaint against us is that we are intellectual. *What we complain of Christendom is that it is not.*" Now we do not stop to press the question, Will intellectual modesty be one of the points in the new Free Religion Creed promised us by this Association? but remark that when any body of men thus turns its back on Christendom, declaring its whole system of religion and society a baseless fabric, they are bound not only to give sufficient reasons for such rejection, but to show the American people a better way. A convention that turns Christianity out of doors as the preliminary to its own vaticinations, practically binds itself to assume the burden of the world's redemption. If six Eastern young men have discovered that "Christendom is not intellectual," they are henceforth the illuminati of the civilized world. It will not do for these men to destroy all that the Western people now lean upon as religion, and when asked for a substitute, gracefully wave off the inquirer by the reply, "*Our creed is creedlessness, our organization is disorganization.*" For whatever

may be the notion of such philosophers in regard to the possibility of holding an amiable neutrality among all conflicting religions and posing themselves in a sublime attitude of general religious non-committal, the people of Western America are not of this sort. They are a practical people, worked within an inch of their lives, full of toil, aspiration and hope, full, too, of anxiety and sorrow and remorse; very imperative to get hold of some religion by which they can stand. They cannot wait till Mr. Frothingham or his grandson draws up his new Free Religious creed; they want daily bread for their spiritual lives. And if there is one thing they detest, in their souls, it is spiritual and social anarchy. Tell them they must abandon their present religion, with the church and order of society built thereon, and they have a right to ask you immediately for something better. They have been at work out here in the woods and prairies subduing a new world now these seventy-five years; have got upon their legs all the institutions of society, after a sort; and are eagerly looking for the best methods to do everything. But they cannot let all this go to wreck on the call of any convention, however "intellectual."

The religious people of the West are not disposed to deny some of the charges this Convention brought against the popular Christianity. That the Christian churches are not yet assemblages of angels, but of fallible human beings; that the clergy are not all, or as a body, of the best possible sort; that the creeds are in certain respects behind the New Testament, the popular ideas of the Bible somewhat confused and crude; that superstition and dogmatism are still great evils; — all this, we suppose, is acknowledged by the best and wisest people in all divisions of the Western church. The great thing the Western religious public wants to know is, — *How to preserve the divine elements of Christianity and free them from their human admixtures; how to do it safely, without losing what has been gained, without plunging our new communities into the bottomless pit of scepticism and atheism and social disorganization.* But this Free Religious Autumnal

Convention disdained the homely work of advice in this direction. It was essentially revolutionary; deciding at once that Christianity must be put out from the past of supreme religious authority over the souls of men. That is an undertaking so radical that it means nothing less than the utter overthrow of Western society. For, as soon as it is attempted, it will be found that Christianity is twisted about every fibre of our individual, social, educational, political, industrial life. Western society is constructed on the supposition that the Christian Religion is true and gives a correct ideal of human existence. When, therefore, these men assume to tell us that Christianity is a superstition of the past, and advise us, each man for himself, to go back to his own intellectual powers and begin anew the work of getting up a system of the universe, and live it out, they advise what is utterly visionary and impossible, in any other state than one where all bonds are cut and utter lawlessness reigns supreme.

But whatever we in the West may say concerning this special Convention, we are forced to meet the issue it presents. For this "Free Religious Association" promises to be, as already said, the most popular form of organized hostility to Christianity. Claim what it will for "freedom," "an open platform," "creedlessness," it is really a popular organization to overthrow the Christian Religion and send back every American to his own soul to make a new religion by the efforts of his own intellectual power. It squarely brings up the momentous question, *Is the Christian Religion to be the faith of the American people? Can we be a free people, developing in the line of American civilization, and still live under the spiritual dominion of the religion of Jesus Christ?* And if not, what hope have we in the Free Religion substitute of reliance on the individual intellect for a new faith?

This is not a new question. In every age and land, among every people, there have been essentially only two kinds of religion. The vast majority of men in all ages have found themselves possessed by the faith that the universe is created by a Supreme Power, on whom it forever depends; that all

souls are the offspring of that Creator, and depend upon him for life and happiness; that all wisdom and excellence consist in his worship and service; that man can only become great, good and beautiful by becoming like him; that this Creator communicates with all men, sending divine and human messengers to tell them his will and show them the way to a heavenly life; that religion is the highest interest of the soul, and the men, institutions and books in which the best religion is enshrined are sacred; that all life, public and private, must be based on religion; that man is always and everywhere what his religion makes him. These are the facts which the vast majority of men in all ages have received with little question. The greatest minds that ever lived have demonstrated that these faiths are reasonable, indeed, that they are founded in human nature. A man as naturally as he thinks and lives, or unites in the family and the state, finds himself under this awful firmament of divine realities, and is compelled to live in accordance with the best revelation he can gain concerning it.

Now the Christian Religion, as proclaimed by Jesus Christ, is the ultimate statement of that primeval faith of the human race, by a divine messenger and Saviour, to mankind. All the ancient religions were founded on the same realities that finally were absorbed into this perfect faith. The Hebrew religion moved along the same track. Christianity is the natural, logical, divine completion of the revelation God has imparted to every soul, and the vast majority of mankind have, in theory, accepted as true. It teaches that God made the universe; is the life of the material world; the divine inspiration of the soul; the Father, Sovereign, Judge of man and all combinations of men. It declares man's supreme duty is to love God and love man, God's child. It makes the whole duty of man love and self-sacrifice; the worship of God and the love of the neighbor as of self. It offers Jesus Christ as the Divine Being sent by God to tell the good news and show the way to salvation; — a character and person so lifted above all other teachers and messengers that his Gospel

and life are a sufficient guidance to all men in all time. The Bible is the great record of the universal revelation of God. The record of this revelation is proven true for scholars by the usual means of verifying any ancient series of books. The revelation itself is proved essentially true and good for all sorts of men, in all circumstances; good for all ages; good for past and present, by its actual results in the world. It is proven good for the future by the fact that its Gospel of love is the only one that can destroy the slavery, sin and superstition of men and make this world a kingdom of heaven; and it opens an immortal life in which the soul shall be able to realize all it longs for of wisdom, beauty, love, under the providence of God, the infinite Father.

This, variously interpreted, held in connection with many human additions, very badly lived up to, is the Christian Religion. Its essential peculiarity is that of all religions that ever held the reverence of mankind. It places man in a universe made by God, and commands him to spend eternity in trying to know, love, serve and worship the Supreme Power. This is the only possible freedom — to love and be like God; and this is the only religion that will stand. Christianity has gathered up the soul of all valuable religions into this. Jesus Christ came "in the fullness of time" and spoke the word that emancipated the race into "the glorious liberty of the children of God."

Now there has always been a class of men in the world — sometimes of thoughtful, highly-gifted and cultivated men — who have adopted a radically opposite theory of religion. Their idea has been to reject this great religion of mankind as superstition; to even repudiate this attitude towards the Deity. All knowledge is accessible only from themselves, and is only an outcome of their own souls. Looking with the eye of the intellectual power within, they discover certain wants, tendencies, faculties, and out of these they construct a theory of the universe. Everything must be subjected to this individual intellectual test. God, man, soul, matter, society, all things, exist only as they can be measured,

mapped and labelled by their individual reasoning power. Even the higher faculties of their own soul, the powers of love, faith, imagination, conscience and will that make man divine, are brought under this remorseless test. What the intellect can comprehend of them and fitly account for shall be said to exist; all else is illusion.

In short, this class of persons enthrone the human intellectual power — only one of the faculties of man, and that not the highest — as God over all the other faculties of the soul; even competent to declare they do not exist, or are unreliable. Then it goes on to arrange a universe according to the limitations of its own intellectual vision. This theory it claims the absolute right to enjoy and live out regardless of consequences. Freedom is this absolute right. Religion is this occupation. "*Free Religion*" *thus turns out to be the deification of the intellectual power of man, in the person of every individual in humanity.*

The whole contrast between these opposite systems may be summed up in one statement. Christianity, the ultimate faith of a healthy humanity, the complement of all productive religion that ever was, revolves about the faith that God made man. "Free" or "Radical Religion," the ultimate result of the investigations of this class of philosophers from the foundation of the world, declares that every individual man creates his own God. *In one system God is the Father of man; in the other, man is the Father of God.*

This is the desert of self-deification towards which every soul tends that gets off the highway that leads to the religion of Christ. The alternative presented to the American people to-day is, — worship the God revealed by Jesus Christ, or, each man of you, make a God of yourself and bow down in self-admiration forevermore.

So this whole imposing fabric called "Free Religion" is reared on the deification of his own intellectual power by every man. It does not even rise to the dignity of a deification of the whole man. It inverts the order of human faculties and human life, and declares a secondary faculty infalli-

ble Pope over all the highest realms of the soul. The higher side of man is his affections, his imagination, his conscience, his intuitive reason, his will and active powers. His reasoning or intellectual powers are, at best, the foreground of his nature. They recognize the eternal realities seen and verified by his nobler powers, arrange and place in order the facts of his knowledge, and make a bridge over which his divine manhood communicates with the world. Of course if this intellectual power be ignored or cramped, the whole man suffers eclipse of his nobler life. But the most disastrous assault that can be made on spiritual freedom is when this power of the intellect is enthroned as supreme, and assumes not only to subjugate all above it, but to put its own little measure on the universe and God. The first evil enterprise of man was in this direction. The serpent in Eden tempted the first pair to disobey God and throw off the authority of their higher nature, to gain the knowledge of good and evil. "*Do this*," said he, "*and ye shall be as Gods.*" The primal sin of man is to repudiate his allegiance to the Almighty and erect his own individual intelligence to the sovereignty of his own soul. Out of that comes an utter disorganization of the human faculties and anarchy in human life. There is no freedom in it, but slavery to the meanest of masters — a human intellect inflated with the conceit that it is Almighty God.

This kind of "Free Religion" never bore any lasting fruits, and never will. Let us see to what it leads men always and everywhere, and ask ourselves if it is the religion for our new Western life.

The strong point of the Free Religionists is superiority of intellect. "*You charge us with being intellectual*," says Mr. Frothingham; "*our complaint against Christendom is that it is not.*" Everywhere now, as always in former ages, we find this peculiar class of minds distinguished by this infinite assumption of superior intellect and culture, and a contempt for the whole human race outside its clique. But the fact is, such men, at the outset, destroy the very possibility of the noblest culture by exalting a secondary faculty to the infalli-

ble throne of their life. My intellectual power is not the noblest thing in my manhood, and if I begin by bringing every other faculty under its infallible criticisms, I throw my whole mind out of gear, and go off on the wrong track altogether. This is a fatal outrage on the soul itself; an attempt at spiritual suicide that leaves it in a state of semi-insanity. And all the knowledge I acquire and all my views, reasonings and proceedings are vitiated by this radical mistake. Instead of getting into the open universe of freedom, I simply tie myself to the stake of my own infallible intellect, and go wandering round and round in my own little circle of individual observation. If I study nature or the soul, history or politics, practical life or the life divine, I look at everything in a false, partial way, and my judgments are second-rate.

Christian scholarship and culture start with the confession that the nobler powers of man, his affections, will, conscience, active energies, imagination and intuitive reason, are the leaders of his life, and give him and all mankind an essentially true account of his position in the universe. Then the intellectual power goes out to explore this glorious world of mystery; guided by a solemn loyalty to truth, reverent of much it cannot explain, content to know what can be known, always falling back on the sublime sense of childhood to God and brotherhood to man. Every truly great intellectual benefactor to his race has been a religious man and contributed his mite of knowledge modestly and gladly to his fellow-men. Christian culture is the flower of all really genuine culture in all ages, and its trophies are the sciences, philosophies, art, music, social and political organizations, churches of the world.

Take any of the great Christian theologians of this or any age, and see how he goes to work. He consecrates himself, by the prayerful, loving service to God and man, the purification of his appetites, the practical knowledge of mankind in all varieties of life, to begin the study of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. So he looks at that great event in a natural way. He comes up to it as the traveller in Switzerland comes to

Mont Blanc, by a gradual approach; beholds it on all sides, and sees its complete relations to men as they actually are in this world. Criticism plays its part; but criticism is the least of the scholar's offices. He learns what Christianity has done for himself, for his fellow-men, for nations, races, and the world. He traces this all back to its origin in the life of Jesus Christ, and says there is a stupendous fact in the history of man which I must admire and accept and account for as well as I can. But if I cannot explain it in all its details, I can testify to the fact and help fill men with a sense of its greatness and far-reaching influence. Thus have the great scholars of the church gone about their work; too often led astray to manufacture private theories and creeds and systems, but always beholding this sublime mountain range of facts towering above them and the world. It is a kind of scholarship that ennobles humanity; the only faithful scientific scholarship that deserves the name.

Now it seems all this is "not intellectual." Well, what is the secret of this boasted "Free Religious" scholarship which declares preremptorily that Christianity is a baseless fabric? It is to shut myself up in the prison of my own intellectual capacity, and through a hole in the shutter look out on Christendom. A minute fact, of course, comes under my observation. That I criticise as I can and pronounce upon it, declaring nothing exists beyond what I behold in this way. This is the secret of the whole system of destructive criticism which, according to these Free Religious scholars, has annihilated the record of Christianity and shown that the church has no real foundation. A man elaborates a theory of abstract life in his own intellect. In that theory there is no personal God, no divine order of revelation to man, no individual immortality of the soul. This theory he takes to the Scriptures; cuts and squares; rejects or accepts; and finally adjusts the records to it. God cannot work a miracle; ergo, the Bible accounts of these wonderful works are false. But the whole New Testament account is interwoven with these records of divine power; ergo, the New Testament is a myth.

Now it matters not how great may be a man's learning or how sharp his critical apparatus in such a method. *The method is wrong.* Jesus is not to be understood by impaling every recorded word and act on the point of a logical paradox, but by opening the whole upper region of the soul to the influence of the words and acts, the life and death, the character, of the Son of God. We could prove our own mother a myth, could change the biography of Abraham Lincoln into a tissue of absurdities, could dissolve the history of every people into a London fog, by this process of investigation. Read first the four Gospels in a natural, healthy frame of mind. Then read the account of Jesus Christ, that Strauss, or Baur, or Renan, or General Hitchcock, or Samuel Johnson, gives of it. While you read you are confounded, puzzled; every fact seems reversed — you may almost feel that character is obliterated. Lay down the book and spend an hour on the street, and you can recall the train of reasoning only by a painful effort of the mind. The whole theory has the same kind of unsoundness that we observe in dreams. *It is an observation of the highest fact of human history by a man who has exalted his own private intellectual power to be universal critic of the universe.*

Of course this kind of scholars in theology are well assured of themselves and declare that all the "thinking men" of the world agree with them. This conceit is the natural result of this process; a sure sign of this mental disease. They are not more intellectual than other men. They only use the intellectual power exclusively in regions where it is not supreme, violently torn away from other powers. It is the common trick of the mental charlatan to produce the impression of a gigantic intellect by suppressing the higher powers of the soul. The fact is, the New Testament records do give a reliable account of the life, character and religion of Jesus Christ, and the early history of Christianity. The critical war in Germany of the last half century has not moved the New Testament from its base. It has modified some theories, changed somewhat the modes of interpretation, thrown great

light all around this period of the world's illumination. But any sincere man can gain from the New Testament a knowledge of Jesus Christ and his religion, accurate enough to make him a saint on earth and an angel in heaven. The Bible is still the guide-book to the nations; and any people living according to its great precepts of national life will become the foremost nation of the earth.

Notwithstanding the claim of "creedlessness" made for this new gospel, it has already developed into an order of principles as characteristic as those of the Catholic Church. The logic of human nature is always uniform, and when a man begins by exalting his own individual intellectual and reasoning faculty to the sovereignty of his soul, you can easily map out the path he will travel in his religious opinions and moral theories.

The basis of all religion is the faith in God. Christianity, in the revelation of Jesus Christ, has given the world the highest idea of God yet held by man — the One, Infinite Spirit of perfect love; "one God and Father of all, above all, through all, and in you all." Whatever failures the church has made in reaching this sublime faith, are due to the natural infirmity of men who are perpetually falling into idolatries now as in all ages of the world. But this awful and inspiring faith stands in the New Testament, a perpetual incitement to a more spiritual worship; and has done more than all things else to lift mankind above materialism and selfishness during the last eighteen centuries.

It is invariably the case that when a man who has once held this glorious faith of Christ cuts adrift from it he has but one landing-place — the deification of himself. The Jew, the Pagan who has stepped out of Polytheism, the Deist who has renounced Materialism or Pantheism, are headed towards this Christian idea of the Deity. But the retrograde movement once begun goes on like a fate to the end. This "Free Religious" movement began among a band of young men reared in the most enlightened circles of Christian belief. At first they proclaimed that they rejected "the Lord Jesus

Christ" because he prevented their spiritual worship of God and their communion with the Holy Spirit. The "personal communion with the Spirit" was the burden of their preaching: and some of our most devout Christian clergy in the East actually believed the "transcendental" movement was a new outpouring of the Spirit upon the church. Not a generation has passed, and where do we find these men? The leading spirits are either on the high-road to, or are already landed in, Pantheism. Their President distinctly says that he does not believe in a God that has any concern for private persons, who hears prayers, who guides nations. Their writings perpetually assail the Christian idea of a personal Father of man. God, they tell us, cannot be found outside the laws of the universe. He is unconscious, and they cannot speak for his morals or his character; if indeed he has any. In short, the current is all one way, and is drifting these men into a materialistic or spiritualistic Pantheism. To such a man there is but one possible practical God — himself. For a while he may build his temple to an idealized humanity. But the thing he knows most accurately in humanity is himself, and he ends in becoming an admiration society of one member, perpetually glorifying and worshipping his own immaculate reason. This has invariably been the end of all men of logical mind who have begun by declaring the intellectual power the supreme umpire in the soul and the test of all knowledge and faith; and so it ever will be. The Western people may be dissatisfied with some of the ideas of the Deity they find in the Christian creeds; but they have not quite reached the mental degradation of holding, each man of them, that he is the "intellectual" side of Almighty God.

The ideas of human nature and the style of character and notion of human destiny coming from this new religion, are equally morbid. Deposed monarchs rapidly go into disgrace. When these men put the nobler side of man under the feet of a usurping power, they soon come to underrate the side of life that comes from the affections, the conscience, the intuitive reason, the imagination, and the active powers. Every-

thing concentrates about the intellectual and logical faculties. They lose confidence in faith, love, self-sacrifice; everything that cannot be brought into their intellectual system is dubious. The personal immortality of the soul, the eternal distinctions of right and wrong, the foundations of truth itself, begin to waver. While they imagine themselves growing "scientific" and especially "reasonable," everybody can see that they are simply growing narrower, more critical and captious, till they almost lose the possibility of doing justice to any style of thought or character but their own. They lose the key to the judgment of society, and their denunciations become ludicrous in their injustice. They cannot estimate events, and see only what they choose in the world. We know tastes differ; but to us the style of character nourished by this "Free Religion" or extreme "Radicalism" is barren and uninspiring to the last degree. When gentlemen of culture and natural amiability come to the West and tell us that the Christian Religion is disappearing from the world; that Christendom is not "intellectual"; that the Christian Church is an assembly of "thieves and murderers"; that it is a disgraceful thing for the President of Cornell University to declare his college is not a Pagan institution; and to talk on, day after day, in a steady strain of inuendo, accusation and sharp criticism, to the effect that the best people in all orders of American society are either knaves or fools, we infer that their "free religion" means a "freedom" verging to impudence and a "religion" not that proclaimed by Jesus in the Golden Rule.

But we only yet see what this infatuation can do for men who were born and bred in Christianity. A man who has lost his leg by amputation feels for a long time a semi-consciousness that his leg is still there; and just in this way men who have cut loose from Christian faith cannot at once shear off the amenities and virtues inherited from a long line of pious and godly ancestors, or resist the atmosphere of Christian morality about them. But give us a generation of children raised up in this new faith, and we shall behold a

new aspect in American affairs, — that utter loosening of all the primal moralities, and that gravitation of the masses towards boundless demoralization, to which whole classes of people bred to Atheism and self-worship in Europe have already come. It is hard enough to live now in this great, wicked West, with all the restraints of Christian morality about our people. Heaven help us in this "free religious" millennium when every man shall be his own God.

Every Christian Church believes the education of the young should be founded on religious instruction; holding that the nobler and divine side of man should be kept healthy as the sole condition that the training of the intellect shall not become a curse. They differ as to the means and methods of this education, and a large body opposes the public schools because it regards them virtually irreligious. But the "Free Religious" philosophers make a clean sweep; not only denouncing the Bible-reading in public schools, but insisting that education itself, public or private, shall be essentially "secular." This means that a child shall be brought up in the idea that his intellect is his chief glory; shall be placed before all sciences and arts without the slightest prepossession in favor of God or any great fact of the religious life. "Science" consists in ignoring all the higher facts of the universe and making his own intellectual yardstick the measure of all things. It is a poor consolation to be told by these men, when they sweep the public school-room clean of all religious instruction, that we can educate our children religiously in the church. What church? A church that is "not dedicated to God"? The "Free Religious" Church, which is to be a public "scientific" lecture room, alternating with a dancing-hall and play-house? We doubt not such an education as this will make young Americans even more sharp, brilliant, self-asserting, "practical" in the way of supreme devotion to self and material things, than now. But we believe that the curse of Western youth is this superficial conceit of being wiser and "smarter" than the whole world, this intolerance of advice and reckless experimenting in

unhallowed fields. Every year or two a new sort of coal comes to our market; wonderful, brilliant, sparkling — a perfect revelation of intensified splendor. We buy it and rejoice in its new blaze till we hear some day "the vein has run out." It was a superficial strata, and we go back to the solid varieties that may be a little sooty and stubborn, but contain the hidden fires that can melt the ore, drive the great engines and bless mankind with perpetual light and warmth. So will this showy system of Free Religious culture of the superficial veins of the soul give us a generation of sparkling, ready, conceited youth; brilliant as the sparks of the forge; selfish as the anvil on which all the sanctities of human life are mauled and twisted and beaten into the implements and agencies of the worship of self.

Every form of religion produces a special variety of social life. The cardinal principle of the Free Religious Association; a creed of creedlessness, an organized disorganization; a falling back for a new intellectual departure in all the sanctities of life; of course places the family "at the mercy of a new generalization." If even the existence of God and the immortality of the soul are open questions, certainly the restraints that a Christian society has thrown around the passions and appetites of men are but wisps of straw before the sharp instruments of those critical reformers. It has long been a matter of public notoriety that ideas of family life and the relations of the sexes are circulating among large numbers of people who have shaken off Christian faith which can only end in "free divorce" and "free love." Even within the iron walls of the Boston proprieties, the community has been startled by more than one repudiation of family ties, "on principle." The Richardson and McFarland scandal in New York uncovered a state of opinion in "radical" circles that forebodes no good for public purity. This extreme tendency has already split the Woman's Rights movement into two hostile parties on the marriage controversy. Yet so powerful still are the bonds of domestic life in New England that numbers of young men and women of superior intelligence

are there flirting with these confusing sexual theories without dreaming that things are practically to be different from the sweetly ordered ways of the "best society" of the American Athens. But the West is a country without a past; a land where people "try on" their creeds with astonishing freedom. These social speculations have already borne such fruits with us as would appall the elegant people who crowd the galleries of the Tremont Temple to applaud the showy rhetoric of Frothingham or ponder over the annihilating logic of Abbot. We see here what becomes of people, ignorant or cultivated, who cut loose from the Christian idea of the marriage relation. Our new States are strown with the wrecks of families stranded on these reckless theories; young matrons drifting back on their mothers, abandoned by those who have sworn to protect them; children worse than orphans, tossed about between the ruptured members of a faithless household; with all the more shameless accompaniments of the gospel of free divorce toppling over into the inferno of free love. We make no charges against the character of anybody; but we assert that the whole tendency of this new Gospel is towards the disorganization of the family life of our country. The man who blows up the embankments of a reservoir is responsible for every man's house swept off by the flood; and he who labors to inspire distrust or contempt for the Christian Religion, and throws every soul back on its own individual reason for a "new deal" in human affairs, must not be surprised if some of the consequences of his madness come back to him in ways that appall even himself.

Equally pronounced is the result of this "Free Religion" in political affairs. It lands us in the political philosophy of Calhoun, Rochefort and Remelin; making every citizen virtually a little emperor with the right to upset government *ad libitum*, till he can get all his rights acknowledged. The blight of European "Republicanism" has been that its leaders have so often been men who believed in no God above themselves, and claimed for the individual man rights utterly inconsistent with social order. Such Republicanism is only

the chaotic strife of a myriad men for individual supremacy; closing up, at last, in the rule of one Cæsar and the dry rot of society itself. According to these gentlemen, the American Republic is such an organization, or must be made so. The American people abhor that sort of republic even more than monarchy, and will give it only the reception they gave to Calhoun's theory of plantation sovereignty as soon as it got in arms against the national life. The whole idea of social reform that goes along with this Free Religion is to destroy public confidence in the society amid which we live; fill the people with contempt for their best institutions and the classes that manage them; if possible upset them all; and then set every man thinking to get up a new ideal society. Such a theory would not even keep alive a "Free Religious Convention," unless there was a police and public opinion outside to prevent the disputants from solving their fierce debates by the law of the strongest.

Of course the Church, Christian, Hebrew, Pagan — all churches where God is worshipped and a supernatural religion is taught — must go too. "The coming man, woman and child will not go to church." If there is a worship, it will be the worship of humanity and self. If there is instruction, it will be in "Social Ethics." What system of "social ethics" can get on its legs and stand long enough to be taught in a community resolved back to its original elements by individual infallibility, we are not informed. But it is useless to follow this extreme idea farther into the jungle of human folly and sin. We are apologetically told by those who strongly countenance and uphold this system of public disorganization, that its apostles are the natural result of the despotism, bigotry and defiance of reason in the Christian Church. That is partly true. The Catholic, and too much the Protestant churches and priesthoods, have often insisted on a blind faith; misunderstood human nature; disowned reason, and insisted on the infallibility of churches and creeds, till multitudes of unreflecting people have been flung off into the circle of scepticism where they are the fit mate-

rial for such teachers to manipulate. Great masses of people in Europe, perhaps a growing number in America to-day, have thus been hurled over into a deification of human reason because Reason has been ignored and defamed. But certainly an educated, reasonable man need not execute this flight from the upper to the nether pole of theology. The religion of Jesus Christ, as proclaimed by himself and his great apostles, contains no such defamation of human nature and reason; no such claim for the infallibility of human churches as this. It is the religion of love, the perfect law of liberty. It says until a man has come into true relations with God, and done justice to his higher and divine nature, he cannot use liberty or any opportunity aright. Slavery, bodily and spiritual, is the awful penalty of sin. In proportion as a man repents of his sins, follows his highest light of conscience and religious faith, he regains his lost freedom, and grows into the "glorious liberty of the children of God." Let a man set up his own intellect as the law of his life, and he ties his manhood forever to the most hopeless slavery to self. Let him reach upward to God, follow the best he knows, cast himself upon the Christ, love God and man, or love the best he can know of God, and he gets out of himself and is on the way to liberty and light in the eternal life. There seems to be some normal defect in a considerable class of brilliant and sincere minds that they can hardly avoid being hurled by one error into a worse extreme. We may bear with their vagaries; but to suppose their sceptical vaticinations are to come to anything but anarchy, reveals an excess of amiability and a lack of sober judgment.

The Christian Religion has this decisive sign of divinity — its power to outgrow all the excrescences and impurities forced upon it by human folly and sin. It was compelled, like everything else everlastingly true, to come into a wicked world and do what it could to lift up man to a higher place. Even in its worst days, and amid its half-pagan corruptions, it did what this "Free Religion" never could achieve — exalted men's ideas and faith, rejuvenated personal character,

moulded society, changed barbarous tribes into civilized nations, awoke the deeps of human nature, and gave an impulse to Art, Literature, Science, such as the world had never seen; remodeled the family and fashioned a new order of society; introduced constitutional government, and made the civilized world what it is. It is easy to say that Europe made itself; but history shows that the nations which rejected Christianity have either perished or are now nations of barbarians; that the leading nations to-day are those which embrace the Protestant Reformation — the first great movement towards the simplicity of Christ. The freest Protestant Religion in the world, all things considered, is found in the United States; and the United States is therefore a republic founded theoretically on the Saviour's Golden Rule. We are sneeringly told by those orators that Western American society rejects much of the morality of the New Testament, — its idea of the sanctity of marriage; its Gospel of unselfishness, and the brotherhood of man. So it does; but is the West in these respects a model for the world? Is it our Indiana divorce laws, our selfish stock-gambling and "cut-throat" business, our interminable quarrellings and scepticisms and sensualities that make the West the hope of the Republic? No; these are the things that all good and wise Western men deplore. The West is what it is of good to-day because of the pure Christianity that is organized into the lives and affairs of its people. Its only line of success is towards that Gospel of Jesus Christ. Its true ideal man is still the Man of Nazareth. Its sovereign law of duty is the higher law of the Christian's God.

It is one of the most fatal things in these Free Religious preachers and propagandists that they too often are found in the West on the side of license and anarchy in a land where all the efforts of good men are needed, for the next half century, to keep us from rushing down to the slough in which the South was landed by leaders who followed this fallacy, every man a king to himself, to the cannon's mouth. We welcome to us every man who can tell us how to purify the

popular Christianity, and unite the people in a practical and devout religion that in worshipping the true God knows how to serve man and make our Eden a new Paradise. But we give no quarter to theories that ever since the dawn of history have led man to glorify himself into a God, and brought the dearest interests of society again and again under baleful eclipse. Let our American young men and women reject this pretentious religion of self-assertion that comes to them arrayed in the graces of rhetoric and the pretense of an infallible science. It is only the old song the serpent sang in Eden: "Reject Almighty God, and ye shall be as gods." We are not gods. We are the children of the ever-living, ever-loving Father. We cannot cultivate ourselves to perfection. We can only be great, and good, and beautiful, by following and being inspired by the loftiest soul of all the ages. And that soul is our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who will lead us to salvation in this world, and in every world, in the eternal life of love to man and love to God.

Article XVII.

Africa: Physical, Historical and Ethnological.

PART IV.

Though man in his physical organization is essentially an animal, yet beyond a few appetites and propensities common to all classes, the human animal is resolved into a moral and intellectual being, having reason and conscience, prudence, forecast, passion and ambition, the possession of which constitutes the distinguishing trait which separates the human from every other class of organized beings, and gathers the races, however diversified, into a common group to form a single type of being. Whether the different races had a common origin, or sprang from a single pair, is a question

which, though heretofore discussed with ability and sharpness, remains still open and undecided. It has been alleged, on the one hand, that the Ethiopian families are descendants of Ham, a son of Noah. But this allegation, though pressed with zeal and earnestness, has failed to solve the problem — how or why a single member of a family should be white and another black, with characteristics essentially different, and each member be able to communicate his own peculiarities to all his posterity, thereby forming races essentially distinct from each other. Such sudden divergence, unless wrought by a special miracle of transformation, appears more anomalous, perhaps incredible, than the slow process of natural selection or progressive development. It has been alleged, too, on the other hand, that the different races, though belonging to the same general class and possessing all its distinguishing characteristics, were nevertheless brought into being from different sources, subject to the same law of physical organization, the same animal chemistry, controlled by the same vital force, which made the man in general, "not as one of the Primates alongside of monkeys," educed by evolution from some inferior class, but a new type, a higher order, "the Archon of animals."

Whatever may be said of these theories, it is certain that the races differ in physical organization, as well as mental and moral endowments. The Ethiopian, whatever his origin, has spread over Africa and there lived, through the long reaches of the past, in perpetual reproduction, a dull and sottish specimen of manhood with intellect and moral feeling barely sufficient to be brought within the group which constitutes the human type. And there, too, he has dwelt and roved and worn out an empty life in indolence and squalor, a mere stagnant pool, never higher, never lower, the representative of primeval man — if barbarism was man's original condition — with little prospect of better and brighter days in the long cycles of the future.

It is never to be forgotten that all civilizations, all growth, all improvement of a people or of nations, depend on the gen-

[illegible] The [illegible] among [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

have ever failed to overcome obstacles, achieve some sort of greatness, and work their way at least into the outer courts of civilization? With indigenous mind, taste, energy, even barbarism will burst its testaceous covering, create for itself a history, and emerge into the brighter realms of intellectual growth and glory. It is thus that the earliest civilizations in human history were brought into prominence and perfection. It is thus, too, that for the lack of intrinsic mental force, the barbarous tribes of the earth have allowed themselves to plod along in dreary monotony, through all the long cycles since the human type of being commenced.

Such was the character and such the condition of the African tribes along the coast of that continent from the Senegal to the southern cape and thence to the Moslem settlements on the east, when that portion of the country was discovered by the nations of Europe. They were not wholly destitute of mental capacity; they were endued with intellect, but intellect abject, dull and incomprehensive. No great minds had arisen among them, to achieve wonders of growth and of grandeur, whose history might remain inscribed on crumbling monuments, the enduring vestiges of their day and their deeds. Mild, docile, superstitious, unresisting, they were easily trained, or forced into compliance with a superior will, and in that particular fitted specially, by nature and habit, to gratify the rapacity of those civilized strangers who had just set foot upon their soil. The first ships which plowed the strange waters took away many of the unsuspecting natives, who, it was soon found, might be made subservient to the lust, luxury and wealth of their Christian masters. Alonzo Gonsalves, a Portuguese adventurer, soon after the discovery of the Senegal, seems to have been the first to call the attention of his countrymen to the African tribes, as articles of a profitable commerce. It required but a few years to exhibit the fatal aptitude, not only of these, but of adventurers from other nations, to learn a lesson so congenial with their feelings, their philosophy and their insatiate love of gain.

The age of the world and the spirit of the nations who had

cast their evil eyes over the defenceless tribes of Africa, were very unfortunate incidents in the changing scenes of that unhappy people. It was not deemed unchristian then — though Christians were often seized without remorse and sold into servitude in the Barbary States — it was not deemed unchristian for Christian people to seize and enslave the hapless blacks on the coast of Africa. Indeed, the enslavement of these unhappy tribes had long prevailed among the older nations of the earth, reaching back into the retreating gloom of the past as far as history extends. Among the Egyptians and Carthaginians slavery was held in honor and became an extensive and profitable business. Large numbers of blacks were stolen from their burning homes, and forcibly imported, alike for service at home and commerce abroad. They were drawn from the interior of the continent, over desert and mountain, by the easy process of fomenting wars and enslaving the vanquished — just as kidnapping has been carried on under Christian patronage in more recent times. Another, and perhaps a darker form of slavery, after the conquests of the Turks, was brought into prominence by the brigands of the Mediterranean. Urged by revenge, the lust of gain, and the remorseless bigotry of the Moslem creed, these freebooters perpetuated a practice, to which even Christian nations, by way of reprisal, gave a ready assent. The Venetians, Genoese, Italians, Spaniards and Portuguese seem to have had no compunctions of conscience in applying the law of force for the seizure and enslavement of the common foe, their Moslem neighbors; since themselves, they knew, would, by these neighbors in similar circumstances, be forced into unwilling servitude. The custom of demanding and obtaining money, as a ransom for such slaves, furnished a very powerful motive for the continuance of the infamous practice.

Common consent is the inevitable result, the legitimate child, of common practice, and that consent is often taken as indisputable evidence of the correctness of the practice. It was not deemed wrong for any people to enslave their own kindred, and more especially an alien race, when taken as

enemies in war, even though that war was piratical and conducted with the sole view of profit by a commerce in human souls! Such was the piratical warfare conducted on the coast of Africa. And it was too great a step after the expulsion of the Moors from Spain, for "the most Christian king and queen" of that country to raise their voice against a practice at once so wicked and so common. Its wickedness, indeed, seems to have been neither seen nor thought of by that "most Christian king," who, after the death of his amiable consort, himself sanctioned, by royal edict, the traffic in African slaves. The same traffic was affirmed a few years later, by Charles V., who, at the age of sixteen, on the death of his grandfather Ferdinand, in 1516, claimed the title of king and assumed the government of Castile and Arragon. A Roman pontiff, of infamous memory, had already given to the King of Portugal all the lands and all the people he might discover from Cape Bajador to the East Indies, "to be conquered and recovered to Christ and his Church." From these terrible decrees, born of bigotry and cradled in greed, the hapless Africans suffered severely.

The great Western World was then open to European rapacity. The indomitable inhabitants of that virgin land could not be forced by cruelty or seduced by persuasion into unwilling servitude to bring out gold from the mines, for the glory, the greed or the wasteful pageantry of an alien race. The attempts to subdue them had rendered them, like a lion at bay, a dangerous foe. The impossibility of enslaving them was doubtless the primary cause of the extensive transportation of the African tribes to the New World. These were more pliant and docile, more desirable as articles of commerce, and were even considered as fit only for the severe toil to which they were hopelessly consigned. The Portuguese, having the earliest possession of the African coast, became deeply involved in the capture and sale of slaves; and they continued the business, with little interference or interruption, for the space of an hundred and fifty years. So great was their influence in that department, that before the year

1600 the Portuguese had become the language in which the traffic was carried on. The great mart for the sale of this human commodity was the Spanish West Indies. The business, therefore, was chiefly confined to the Spanish and Portuguese, who were unwilling to allow other nations to participate in its glory, its infamy, or its profit. It was even conducted with an ostentatious display of religious zeal—*pro amore Dei*—"for the love of God and the salvation of souls."

Other nations, however, were not to be deprived of a commerce so rich in material productiveness. The French took possession of a portion of the coast on the assumed right of prior discovery, claiming to have known the country and traded at Sesters as early as 1346. The Dutch and English made no claim beyond the general right of all nations to the freedom of trade. They pushed themselves forward to take part in a traffic which had already proved so rich and remunerative. The first commercial enterprise from England to the coast of Guinea was undertaken in 1536. A few years later, Sir John Hawkins, assisted by several English merchants, fitted out a small squadron, sailed to the coast of Guinea, obtained, by fraud and force, a cargo of three hundred natives, carried them to Hispaniola, and there, in a contraband traffic, sold them as slaves. Success in this instance stimulated a second and even a third attempt in the same direction; but in returning from the last, he was attacked and defeated by a Spanish fleet. None of these blacks seem to have been carried into England. About the same time, perhaps a little later, 1554, a British sailor, Capt. John Lok, proceeded with a few ships to Cape Messurado, near the present site of Monrovia, explored that coast, and brought home "certain black slaves." These are supposed to have been the first of the kind ever seen in England. Their appearance awakened so much interest, that in 1558 Queen Elizabeth, then just raised to the throne, at the solicitation of certain merchants of Exeter, and other persons, granted a charter for an exclusive trade for ten years over the extensive tract of country from the Senegal to the Gambia. It is not proba-

ble that she was aware of the kind of traffic in which these merchants proposed to engage.

From that time, however, the traffic in human flesh rapidly increased among all civilized and Christian nations. Scarcely a voice was raised against it. Among the most pure and pious people, it seems to have been deemed an ample recompense for the hard toil of the luckless blacks, to secure for them their souls' eternal salvation. But even this was seldom attempted by the hard-faced planters, who evidently had more need of redeeming grace for the sanctification of their own souls, than the wretched blacks whom they whipped into unwilling toil. As the demand increased for this kind of labor, private adventurers and joint stock companies alike entered the field — the former often in violation of law, daring the risks to secure the rewards of the inhuman traffic. In 1618, James I. of England granted a charter to a company to trade in the extensive tract embraced in the earlier grant of Queen Elizabeth. But this company soon failed, and another succeeded under a grant of Charles I., which conducted a trade on the coast of Guinea, Benin and Angola for about thirty years. In the mean time, the British East India Company had been formed, and, in the first year of the protectorate of Cromwell, 1651, obtained from Parliament the privilege of trading on the coast of Africa for a few years. In 1662 another company was formed, and having received a grant from Charles II. to trade on that coast, undertook to supply the West India market with three thousand slaves annually. This company, however, soon passed away and was succeeded by the Royal African Company, chartered 1672, with the exclusive right to trade for a thousand years over the whole tract of country from the Senegal to the Cape of Good Hope.

At the same time charters had been granted and companies formed in other countries for the same purpose — by the French, Dutch, Spanish, and other nations. The great demand for laborers in the different American settlements induced the most extraordinary methods to procure a supply.

Past the middle of the seventeenth century, the Spaniards, then on friendly terms with the Genoese, entered into a contract — *assiento* — with that commercial people, by which certain privileges were conferred upon them on condition of their furnishing laborers, at a stipulated price, from the coast of Guinea for the West India market. A treaty formed about the same time with the Sublime Porte gave greater security and renewed vigor to the commerce of Genoa. But shortly afterwards, this people, having incurred the displeasure of Louis XIV. of France, were attacked and subdued by that monarch, and the most humiliating terms of peace imposed upon them. In this unfortunate affair, the famous commercial contract with Spain — *assiento* — was lost to the Genoese by its transfer to the Royal Guinea Company of France. It was not permitted, however, to remain long in the possession of that company. The inexorable vicissitudes of war which gave them possession, soon tore it from them — not, however, until they had been able to secure an immense profit in gold and silver as the reward of their industry. By the treaty of Utrecht, 1713, the *assiento* was transferred to England and then to the South Sea Company — a stupendous bubble which a short time before had been chartered by the British Government. That company, for the grant of certain exclusive privileges, subscribed for government stock to the amount of $40,000,000, and agreed to import into the Spanish West Indies one hundred and forty-four negroes in thirty years — four thousand eight hundred annually.

At this time the British possessions, as well as the Spanish in America, furnished an extensive market for the sale of slaves. American, no less than British vessels, joined together and, hand in hand, found their way to the African coast, and returned with the accustomed freight of human flesh. "The British Government continued to exhibit the most parental care for those honorable traffickers in the souls of men." When South Carolina, in 1760, passed an act prohibiting the further importation of slaves, New England in silence condemned the audacity, and the home government

speedily annulled the act, declaring with indignation that "the slave-trade was necessary and beneficial to the mother country." A similar fate, 1774, followed an effort to restrain the trade in one of the West India Islands. The British Government, by its appointed agents, declared in tones of menace that "we cannot allow the colonies to check or discourage in any degree a traffic so beneficial to the nation." And the trade continued "with unabated ferocity" until 1807. In sixteen years prior to that date, one hundred and fifty thousand slaves were imported into the island of Jamaica alone. The trade reached out from island to continent over a large portion of the Western world. Brazil was a Portuguese colony, and that nation had the entire control, as well as the special honor, of its infamous trade in living souls. How many of the poor Africans had been kidnapped and carried away during the long, sad years of its recognition as a legitimate traffic, it is impossible to determine. But in all probability the gloomy record reaches far into the millions. In 1768, one hundred and four thousand were transported to the western market, and about the same number annually for several years thereafter. During the American Revolution, the trade diminished; but in 1786 it was again greatly increased — the English alone having carried away over forty-two thousand in a single year!

The years rolled on in sorrow and sadness to the hapless blacks on the African coast. Not a year, or a month, or scarcely a day passed by without the sundering of some ties of affection and the breaking up of some domestic relations by the seizure of young and vigorous men and women to be hurried into hopeless servitude in a foreign land. Yet their numbers seemed not to diminish in their native land, nor were the lessons of wisdom and prudence, born of suffering, peril and disaster, brought home to their hearts. Stolid and improvident, perhaps childishly passionate and sometimes revengeful, having little regard for each other's welfare, little capacity to comprehend a common danger and provide for a common defence, little skill in war, and little spirit to resist

eration or procreation among them of minds above the common class, which stand out bold, sharp, original, attractive, compel attention and serve as guides, innovators, schoolmasters, to arouse the masses, instruct the ignorant, and lift up the degraded to a higher plane of thought and of action. Alien instructors, adventitious leaders, self-sacrificing philanthropists, may do much for the elevation of races sunk in barbarism; but they can never supply the lack of indigenous intellect, or work out a permanent and advancing civilization without it. On the other hand, whenever a people, or a nation, rich in all the elements of growth and improvement, shall cease to bring forth great men, and sink to the passive enjoyment of material prosperity in ease and affluence, the tale of its glory is soon told, the zenith of its greatness is clouded and past, and its sad, sober period of decay has commenced! The evidences of these truths are borne out, gloomy and bare, as well from the history of all civilized nations of past ages, as from the barbarous tribes of the earth who have no history — no men to write a history, and no intellect, or taste, or capacity to work out a literature in which it can be written. The decay of civilization is painfully prominent along the borders of the Mediterranean and the waters of the Nile, and even over the extensive plains of Persia and Babylon where once glowed the grandest which the world ever saw. Egypt, Meroe, Chaldea, Phœnicia and Greece — alas, how fallen!

As for barbarism, unrelieved, unadorned, unimproved, the African tribes stand out a sad and sorrowful example. Will it be said that, placed in a suitable condition, surrounded with favorable influences and possessed of proper advantages, they would soon work out a civilization for themselves? It may be so, but how very painful it is to look back over the long, long, unrelieved monotony of their thoughtless, brainless degradation! What other people on earth have lived so long on the same level, generation after generation, with so little change, so little improvement? What other people so numerous and prolific, known even to the remotest history,

have ever failed to overcome obstacles, achieve some sort of greatness, and work their way at least into the outer courts of civilization? With indigenous mind, taste, energy, even barbarism will burst its testaceous covering, create for itself a history, and emerge into the brighter realms of intellectual growth and glory. It is thus that the earliest civilizations in human history were brought into prominence and perfection. It is thus, too, that for the lack of intrinsic mental force, the barbarous tribes of the earth have allowed themselves to plod along in dreary monotony, through all the long cycles since the human type of being commenced.

Such was the character and such the condition of the African tribes along the coast of that continent from the Senegal to the southern cape and thence to the Moslem settlements on the east, when that portion of the country was discovered by the nations of Europe. They were not wholly destitute of mental capacity; they were endued with intellect, but intellect abject, dull and incomprehensive. No great minds had arisen among them, to achieve wonders of growth and of grandeur, whose history might remain inscribed on crumbling monuments, the enduring vestiges of their day and their deeds. Mild, docile, superstitious, unresisting, they were easily trained, or forced into compliance with a superior will, and in that particular fitted specially, by nature and habit, to gratify the rapacity of those civilized strangers who had just set foot upon their soil. The first ships which plowed the strange waters took away many of the unsuspecting natives, who, it was soon found, might be made subservient to the lust, luxury and wealth of their Christian masters. Alonzo Gonsalves, a Portuguese adventurer, soon after the discovery of the Senegal, seems to have been the first to call the attention of his countrymen to the African tribes, as articles of a profitable commerce. It required but a few years to exhibit the fatal aptitude, not only of these, but of adventurers from other nations, to learn a lesson so congenial with their feelings, their philosophy and their insatiate love of gain.

The age of the world and the spirit of the nations who had

cast their evil eyes over the defenceless tribes of Africa, were very unfortunate incidents in the changing scenes of that unhappy people. It was not deemed unchristian then—though Christians were often seized without remorse and sold into servitude in the Barbary States—it was not deemed unchristian for Christian people to seize and enslave the hapless blacks on the coast of Africa. Indeed, the enslavement of these unhappy tribes had long prevailed among the older nations of the earth, reaching back into the retreating gloom of the past as far as history extends. Among the Egyptians and Carthaginians slavery was held in honor and became an extensive and profitable business. Large numbers of blacks were stolen from their burning homes, and forcibly imported, alike for service at home and commerce abroad. They were drawn from the interior of the continent, over desert and mountain, by the easy process of fomenting wars and enslaving the vanquished—just as kidnapping has been carried on under Christian patronage in more recent times. Another, and perhaps a darker form of slavery, after the conquests of the Turks, was brought into prominence by the brigands of the Mediterranean. Urged by revenge, the lust of gain, and the remorseless bigotry of the Moslem creed, these freebooters perpetuated a practice, to which even Christian nations, by way of reprisal, gave a ready assent. The Venetians, Genoese, Italians, Spaniards and Portuguese seem to have had no compunctions of conscience in applying the law of force for the seizure and enslavement of the common foe, their Moslem neighbors; since themselves, they knew, would, by these neighbors in similar circumstances, be forced into unwilling servitude. The custom of demanding and obtaining money, as a ransom for such slaves, furnished a very powerful motive for the continuance of the infamous practice.

Common consent is the inevitable result, the legitimate child, of common practice, and that consent is often taken as indisputable evidence of the correctness of the practice. It was not deemed wrong for any people to enslave their own kindred, and more especially an alien race, when taken as

enemies in war, even though that war was piratical and conducted with the sole view of profit by a commerce in human souls! Such was the piratical warfare conducted on the coast of Africa. And it was too great a step after the expulsion of the Moors from Spain, for "the most Christian king and queen" of that country to raise their voice against a practice at once so wicked and so common. Its wickedness, indeed, seems to have been neither seen nor thought of by that "most Christian king," who, after the death of his amiable consort, himself sanctioned, by royal edict, the traffic in African slaves. The same traffic was affirmed a few years later, by Charles V., who, at the age of sixteen, on the death of his grandfather Ferdinand, in 1516, claimed the title of king and assumed the government of Castile and Arragon. A Roman pontiff, of infamous memory, had already given to the King of Portugal all the lands and all the people he might discover from Cape Bajador to the East Indies, "to be conquered and recovered to Christ and his Church." From these terrible decrees, born of bigotry and cradled in greed, the hapless Africans suffered severely.

The great Western World was then open to European rapacity. The indomitable inhabitants of that virgin land could not be forced by cruelty or seduced by persuasion into unwilling servitude to bring out gold from the mines, for the glory, the greed or the wasteful pageantry of an alien race. The attempts to subdue them had rendered them, like a lion at bay, a dangerous foe. The impossibility of enslaving them was doubtless the primary cause of the extensive transportation of the African tribes to the New World. These were more pliant and docile, more desirable as articles of commerce, and were even considered as fit only for the severe toil to which they were hopelessly consigned. The Portuguese, having the earliest possession of the African coast, became deeply involved in the capture and sale of slaves; and they continued the business, with little interference or interruption, for the space of an hundred and fifty years. So great was their influence in that department, that before the year

1600 the Portuguese had become the language in which the traffic was carried on. The great mart for the sale of this human commodity was the Spanish West Indies. The business, therefore, was chiefly confined to the Spanish and Portuguese, who were unwilling to allow other nations to participate in its glory, its infamy, or its profit. It was even conducted with an ostentatious display of religious zeal—*pro amore Dei*—"for the love of God and the salvation of souls."

Other nations, however, were not to be deprived of a commerce so rich in material productiveness. The French took possession of a portion of the coast on the assumed right of prior discovery, claiming to have known the country and traded at Sesters as early as 1346. The Dutch and English made no claim beyond the general right of all nations to the freedom of trade. They pushed themselves forward to take part in a traffic which had already proved so rich and remunerative. The first commercial enterprise from England to the coast of Guinea was undertaken in 1536. A few years later, Sir John Hawkins, assisted by several English merchants, fitted out a small squadron, sailed to the coast of Guinea, obtained, by fraud and force, a cargo of three hundred natives, carried them to Hispaniola, and there, in a contraband traffic, sold them as slaves. Success in this instance stimulated a second and even a third attempt in the same direction; but in returning from the last, he was attacked and defeated by a Spanish fleet. None of these blacks seem to have been carried into England. About the same time, perhaps a little later, 1554, a British sailor, Capt. John Lok, proceeded with a few ships to Cape Messurado, near the present site of Monrovia, explored that coast, and brought home "certain black slaves." These are supposed to have been the first of the kind ever seen in England. Their appearance awakened so much interest, that in 1558 Queen Elizabeth, then just raised to the throne, at the solicitation of certain merchants of Exeter, and other persons, granted a charter for an exclusive trade for ten years over the extensive tract of country from the Senegal to the Gambia. It is not proba-

ble that she was aware of the kind of traffic in which these merchants proposed to engage.

From that time, however, the traffic in human flesh rapidly increased among all civilized and Christian nations. Scarcely a voice was raised against it. Among the most pure and pious people, it seems to have been deemed an ample recompense for the hard toil of the luckless blacks, to secure for them their souls' eternal salvation. But even this was seldom attempted by the hard-faced planters, who evidently had more need of redeeming grace for the sanctification of their own souls, than the wretched blacks whom they whipped into unwilling toil. As the demand increased for this kind of labor, private adventurers and joint stock companies alike entered the field — the former often in violation of law, daring the risks to secure the rewards of the inhuman traffic. In 1618, James I. of England granted a charter to a company to trade in the extensive tract embraced in the earlier grant of Queen Elizabeth. But this company soon failed, and another succeeded under a grant of Charles I., which conducted a trade on the coast of Guinea, Benin and Angola for about thirty years. In the mean time, the British East India Company had been formed, and, in the first year of the protectorate of Cromwell, 1651, obtained from Parliament the privilege of trading on the coast of Africa for a few years. In 1662 another company was formed, and having received a grant from Charles II. to trade on that coast, undertook to supply the West India market with three thousand slaves annually. This company, however, soon passed away and was succeeded by the Royal African Company, chartered 1672, with the exclusive right to trade for a thousand years over the whole tract of country from the Senegal to the Cape of Good Hope.

At the same time charters had been granted and companies formed in other countries for the same purpose — by the French, Dutch, Spanish, and other nations. The great demand for laborers in the different American settlements induced the most extraordinary methods to procure a supply.

Past the middle of the seventeenth century, the Spaniards, then on friendly terms with the Genoese, entered into a contract — *assiento* — with that commercial people, by which certain privileges were conferred upon them on condition of their furnishing laborers, at a stipulated price, from the coast of Guinea for the West India market. A treaty formed about the same time with the Sublime Porte gave greater security and renewed vigor to the commerce of Genoa. But shortly afterwards, this people, having incurred the displeasure of Louis XIV. of France, were attacked and subdued by that monarch, and the most humiliating terms of peace imposed upon them. In this unfortunate affair, the famous commercial contract with Spain — *assiento* — was lost to the Genoese by its transfer to the Royal Guinea Company of France. It was not permitted, however, to remain long in the possession of that company. The inexorable vicissitudes of war which gave them possession, soon tore it from them — not, however, until they had been able to secure an immense profit in gold and silver as the reward of their industry. By the treaty of Utrecht, 1713, the *assiento* was transferred to England and then to the South Sea Company — a stupendous bubble which a short time before had been chartered by the British Government. That company, for the grant of certain exclusive privileges, subscribed for government stock to the amount of $40,000,000, and agreed to import into the Spanish West Indies one hundred and forty-four negroes in thirty years — four thousand eight hundred annually.

At this time the British possessions, as well as the Spanish in America, furnished an extensive market for the sale of slaves. American, no less than British vessels, joined together and, hand in hand, found their way to the African coast, and returned with the accustomed freight of human flesh. "The British Government continued to exhibit the most parental care for those honorable traffickers in the souls of men." When South Carolina, in 1760, passed an act prohibiting the further importation of slaves, New England in silence condemned the audacity, and the home government

speedily annulled the act, declaring with indignation that "the slave-trade was necessary and beneficial to the mother country." A similar fate, 1774, followed an effort to restrain the trade in one of the West India Islands. The British Government, by its appointed agents, declared in tones of menace that "we cannot allow the colonies to check or discourage in any degree a traffic so beneficial to the nation." And the trade continued "with unabated ferocity" until 1807. In sixteen years prior to that date, one hundred and fifty thousand slaves were imported into the island of Jamaica alone. The trade reached out from island to continent over a large portion of the Western world. Brazil was a Portuguese colony, and that nation had the entire control, as well as the special honor, of its infamous trade in living souls. How many of the poor Africans had been kidnapped and carried away during the long, sad years of its recognition as a legitimate traffic, it is impossible to determine. But in all probability the gloomy record reaches far into the millions. In 1768, one hundred and four thousand were transported to the western market, and about the same number annually for several years thereafter. During the American Revolution, the trade diminished; but in 1786 it was again greatly increased — the English alone having carried away over forty-two thousand in a single year!

The years rolled on in sorrow and sadness to the hapless blacks on the African coast. Not a year, or a month, or scarcely a day passed by without the sundering of some ties of affection and the breaking up of some domestic relations by the seizure of young and vigorous men and women to be hurried into hopeless servitude in a foreign land. Yet their numbers seemed not to diminish in their native land, nor were the lessons of wisdom and prudence, born of suffering, peril and disaster, brought home to their hearts. Stolid and improvident, perhaps childishly passionate and sometimes revengeful, having little regard for each other's welfare, little capacity to comprehend a common danger and provide for a common defence, little skill in war, and little spirit to resist

aggression, they became an easy prey to their cruel and rapacious visitors. Every day brought to their shores a similar class of men who became daily more and more inhuman and depraved. Persistence in the traffic served only to blunt their moral perceptions and develop the inevitable result—piracy and murder. The traffic itself had scarcely a redeeming trait to elevate its friends and abettors above the level of common brigands. Some good men may have tarnished their lives by contact with it; but there is scarcely a doubt that large numbers of those engaged in it were drawn from the lowest class of civilized society, too loose in morals and too nearly akin to freebooters to allow them a residence with safety in their respective homes. A fact so prominent and undisputed furnishes, with sufficient clearness, both the cause and the explanation of the large gathering of pirates and brigands on the African coast within the zone of the slave-trade. It was well understood that merchant-ships, engaged in commerce with the East Indies and constantly passing along that coast, were often freighted with the richest and choicest goods, and sometimes with immense treasure of the precious metals. Nothing was more natural than for men of loose morals and desperate fortunes, at a distance from home, to join in any enterprise which promised a speedy return of wealth, with little danger of detection and punishment. And the sober events of history confirmed the general character of these men, reputed to have been "of the worst kind." As early as the year 1600, pirates began to mingle with the more lawful traders, and sometimes whole crews of the latter were seduced from their legal pursuits and drawn by its blandishments into the vortex of piracy. When, near the close of the seventeenth century, a great brood of buccaneers, hovering about the West India Islands, was broken up, they spread themselves over the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, and many found a less stormy retreat and more congenial spirits on the coast of Africa. There, for the space of thirty years, they became a power and a terror, which threatened the destruction of all the commerce of the East. With an audacity

unprecedented, they made their attacks on defenceless places, seized and possessed some of the most prominent settlements, and held them for a considerable length of time. Sierra Leone seems to have been a special object of their attacks, and at one time was made a rendezvous for their commercial depredations.

The financial policy of the nations interested in the African trade doubtless exerted another powerful influence in the promotion of piracy. The seizure and sale of defenceless blacks had become a profitable commerce; and when royal grants were issued conferring the exclusive privilege of that trade upon a few companies on the payment of a stipulated sum into the national treasury, they naturally created irritation and gave rise to a contraband trade. Thousands of unprincipled men were ready to engage in the traffic even in defiance of law and at the risk of its penalties. Baffled and defeated in their attempts, they were maddened by the exclusiveness and sought revenge. With such feelings, it required but a single step to glide from the contraband trade to the utter lawlessness of piracy. Base men had too much sense not to perceive the inconsistency of protecting the abduction of blacks, or sanctifying national kidnapping by law, and condemning as piracy individual seizures made without the shield of law! It is therefore scarcely a matter of surprise that piracy prevailed on the African coast, and greatly molested the East India trade. Even after the trade was abolished in England, as late as 1830, piratical vessels were not unfrequent on that coast.

It might have been this fact that first called the attention of grave and thinking men to the African slave-trade with a view of its abolishment. The evil had long been seen and deplored by philanthropic minds — less perhaps in connection with piracy than on account of its own intrinsic turpitude, as a monstrous wrong, a flagrant violation of all the essential duties of man to man. It was not, however, until near the close of the eighteenth century that those strenuous efforts were undertaken which in England and France resulted at

last in the abolition of the trade. Great exigencies usually bring forth men to meet them. The sad wail of a burdened people was borne on every breeze to the hearts and homes of all the civilized world. The Æolian lyre of many a heart bore back the sound with deeper and intenser pathos. The Society of Friends in this country and in England seem to have taken the initial steps in answer to this momentous wail. A self-constituted committee, of which Dr. Benjamin Rush and James Pemberton — the one a distinguished physician and the other a prominent Quaker of Philadelphia — were leading men, had been organized in this country to inquire into the condition of the African slave-trade. The War of the Revolution interrupted for several years the action of the committee. In the mean time, the friends of the enslaved African in England had increased in numbers, and were taking measures to unite their efforts for a common purpose.

While thus engaged, a young man, of brilliant parts, unknown to fame, who had just received a bachelor's prize at Magdalen College in the University of Cambridge, presented himself and entered the lists for another prize on the question — *Anne liceat invitos in servitutem dare?* "Is it lawful to enslave men against their will?" That young man was Thomas Clarkson, whose robust intellect, even in early life, not only achieved the honor desired, but won a higher record in the annals of eternal fame. He bore away the prize, and soon after resolved to devote his life, if necessary, to the relief of the African race. His zeal and enthusiasm brought together the scattered friends of that unhappy people, and a committee was soon arranged, himself a prominent member, for the purpose of securing the entire abolishment both of the plunder and sale of the African race. It was a difficult and arduous undertaking, and aroused the most violent opposition from those who imagined their own interest or the nation's welfare was involved in the result. But the friends of the measure, equal to the emergency, had anticipated and prepared for such obstructions. The committee quietly pursued their work, and at length secured the aid of Mr. Wilber-

force, a member of Parliament from the County of York. Through his efforts, the subject was brought before that body in the form of a proposition to abolish the trade. But the opposition still continued, violent and relentless, the measure was defeated, and the years rolled on. Mr. Clarkson visited Paris and made the acquaintance there of some earnest friends of his movement among the leaders of the French Revolution. Among the foremost of these were Mirabeau, Condorcet, Petion, and other French infidels, as well as the noble and distinguished Marquis de la Fayette. He was received by all there with great kindness, and they entered with zeal and enthusiasm into his plans and purposes. On his return to England, the subject, through the aid of his faithful coadjutors, was again brought before the Parliament, but only to suffer another failure. Yet the friends of the measure, though often defeated, were not discouraged. Changes of opinion on the part of leading statesmen brought them powerful acquisitions in both houses of Parliament. Among the most prominent and influential of these were Lord Granville, Mr. Canning, Mr. Fox, Lord Erskine and the Duke of Gloucester. Time passed on. The agitation of the subject still continued, gaining strength and making conquests every year, and stretching its dull form along, from its commencement, over a period of above twenty years. At length a bill abolishing the trade was introduced into Parliament, passed both houses, after a severe contest, and on the 25th of March, 1807, received the royal sanction. Thus ended the long strife! Then rang the pæans of joy throughout the land!

This momentous event in the history of African slavery exerted its influence on other nations. In France, however, the progress of the revolution prevented the prompt action of the government. The great questions of state policy to be settled by the arbitrament of war left little time for the consideration of philanthropic matters. After the abdication of Napoleon, and the restoration of the Bourbon dynasty, the subject was agitated, but nothing definite was accomplished — nothing until the return of Napoleon from Elba, and the

expulsion of Louis XVIII. from his kingdom. Then, by that restless agitator, a decree was issued for the abolition of the slave-trade throughout the realm. That decree, after the second abdication of Napoleon, was reäffirmed by the restored Bourbon, and the slave-trade abolished in the kingdom.

Thus ends the tale of philanthropy, brief and imperfect — the story of persevering efforts made in behalf of the poor, wretched, debased Africans. Back then from these scenes of civilization — turn back once more to the storms and sunshine, the mountains and deserts, the rank vegetation, the pestiferous air, and the untutored inhabitants of solemn Africa. How soon were those native dwellers recognized by the strange people who came among them, as belonging to the great fold of humanity. The face upturned, the impress of the Divinity, was there — there in that wild, wonderful, mysterious, miasmatic country! And there, too, though unknown and unadored, was the one true and living God, powerful and merciful, doing his will and working his wonders alike among Heathen and Christians, barbarous and civilized, and bearing them all onward, each in his sphere, to a higher life — the knowledge of Himself.

> Os homini sublime dedit, cœlumque tueri
> Jussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus.

Even the first visitors saw their own image reflected in the erect form of the African type, and felt that these, like all human beings, had souls to be subdued and redeemed to Christ. Yet the lust of gain had overruled and overawed philanthropy and pressed down the race until the great effort was made to abolish the trade in slaves. Out of this effort there gleamed a radiance of beauty, and arose another, more auspicious movement — the purpose and effort to unfold to these poor heathen the light of Christ; to give them instruction concerning the Christian's God, the Christian faith, and the Christian's home in heaven. This grand movement has its fulfillment in the work of the Christian Missions, now in successful operation along the whole coast of the continent, east, west and south, and far into the interior. The Christian Missions in Africa — a subject to be considered hereafter.

ARTICLE XVIII.

The Successful Christian Ministry.

QUESTIONS of qualifications of men who go forth to preach Christianity provoke many differences where it would naturally seem agreement must exist. What constitutes Christian faith and life is at the bottom of the difficulty. We shall not assume infallibility to decide in such matters of difference, while the character and scope of our paper will lead us to express an opinion in the case. We seek to answer the question, What are the conditions of success in the Christian ministry? While every respondent would doubtless give an answer varying in important particulars from every other, it will be our aim to show how the correct reply will necessarily contain certain invariable terms. An interesting and instructive paper might be prepared on the variables of the successful ministry. On these, however, we shall touch incidentally. We inquire for the constant conditions of its success. In the work of the Christian church, each generation of prophets will have its peculiar advantages and disadvantages. But assuming the constancy of essential Christianity and human nature, there are changeless qualifications for every generation of promulgators and leaders of Christian thought and sentiment. The variables in successive generations will relate to the preacher's intellectual traits and preparations, and the changed social and historical conditions of his era. While these things will always loosen or intensify in the preacher the permanent conditions of success, they can never destroy them without destroying the preacher. We may here premise, what the reader will perhaps have stopped to reflect upon, that although intellectual preparation seems, at first thought, to fall necessarily under the permanent necessities, we place it among the variables. Considering intellectual preparation as meaning the proficiency of the schools of arts and theology, we call to mind the unquestioned power for good of great numbers of the faithful in the Christian ministry from the disciples to the

present day, who have no claims to our consideration as men of culture. The educational fitness of the ministry for its specific work of consolation, reform, and salvation, is determined by the intellectual standard of the average mind of an age. It should be in advance of this average, and, for the most part, has always been so, but it is historical truth, we think, that when even down to the average, incalculable success has crowned the humble labors and unfaltering faith and zeal of thousands. In our own time, we may observe, intellectual qualification is a question of paramount consideration. Probably at no time in the history of the church have the demands of a comprehensive mental culture for the ministry been so imperative as now. True, the great European universities grew primarily out of mediæval ecclesiasticism, and gave the intellectual direction of Europe to the clergy for nearly five centuries. This placed a certain high state of culture at a premium among the dignitaries and large numbers of the common monks and priests of the church. But it was intellectualism in chains. Neither human nature, history, nor science, nor civil government, rose to particular eminence as questions of modifying influence and sources of truth with the ministry and future of the church. Exceptions there were with persons, but intellectual culture, as hospitality to truth, and the better comprehension of human want and reform, of liberty and power of human nature, was little known. It was only when larger liberty gave the people larger mental development that the new demands arose, which in our own age and country are daily increasing. The ministry to-day that is not prepared to express an intelligent opinion with reasons upon almost every question concerning human well-being, is anachronistic. Religious thought and life, expounding with the liberty and love native to Christianity, ensphere all human interests and make the religious teacher and leader a judge and exponent of all things, whether he will or no. Hence the unparalleled generosity and activity of all Christian communions in matters educational. The few schools and state universities of our country enhance the necessity of schools of theology and of literary in-

stitutions under the various denominations, that every preparation essential to meet the intelligence of the people may be cared for in behalf of the incoming ministry.

With others, Universalists are making an honorable record in this work. Broad and practical culture is our denominational need, and a necessity for future obligations. It is wiser for us to send from our colleges *into* our theological schools, and thence into the world, a dozen thoroughly equipped men annually, than a score or two of hastily, half-trained men, unable to enter the freshman class of a college. We recognize the usefulness of such men, some of them rising to eminence through native force of intellect and fruitful experiences and study in their ministry; but that our methods of ministerial education need revising, and more encouragement given and longer preparation insisted upon, seem to us imperative. The remedy is largely with our people. They ask for first-class men; let them come forward and make our institutions first-class, and provide for not only the theological but the college student who may need aid in the prosecution of his longer course of preparation. In important particulars, we are called to do constructive work. We occupy a pronouced position in the religious movements of our day. However near other branches of the church are coming to us, or we approaching them, it is clear enough that they are many steps removed from our positive attitude relative to the nature of the divine government and its results now and hereafter, and the instructions of history and the Gospel of Christ concerning it. This fact is all the more clear, now that we are recognized as the largest and best organized liberal wing of the church. It has taken a century for the significance of a radical, theological reform, led by Universalists, to dawn upon the Protestant sects of America as a fact worthy more respectful consideration, and calling for careful scrutiny and judicial investigation. We venture to say this, even after reading and pondering the following lines of President Stearns of Amherst College: "It is now, for the most part, conceded that, whatever may be said of Christianity as a supernatural religion, it must be acknow-

ledged that the New Testament as it stands teaches both it and *the system of connected doctrines which the church has generally believed.* We shall probably be opposed by comparatively few intelligent persons, when we assert that the system of interpretation described (i. e., that of accepting the Scriptures and rejecting evangelical theology,) is *obsolete.* Indeed, the idea of retaining the Bible as of supernatural authority, and of excluding the main features of the evangelical system from it, is hopeless and absurd." [1]

[1] Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1870, pp. 470–71.

Evidently President Stearns does not deem Universalism as any more than an idea hopeless and absurd. Perhaps the recent utterances of Plymouth pulpit may lead him even to think more judiciously of a doctrine destined to destroy "the main features of the evangelical system," and reconstruct all that is left of it. We can assure him, at least, that the "few intelligent persons" who cannot accept his easily made assertions as true, are very confident, by the signs of the times, that even the evangelical world, of which he is a distinguished member, is realizing that the system of interpretation he thinks obsolete is, in fact, demanding increased attention and making decided headway in his own ranks. But we would draw a lesson from such representations of our interpretations of Scripture as those of the President of Amherst. We cannot adequately present the Universalist side of Christian theology and philosophy until our schools afford time, discipline and genius to do far more than we have yet accomplished. Christian doctrine yet waits for adequate statement. What with the Christian Unitarianism of this country, the work of our denominational writers, and the English Unitarians, led by Martineau, we have the outlines of a rational, scriptural and philosophical statement of Christian doctrine, which awaits some great organizing and inspired mind to bring it into due proportions and unity of form. Though our part of the labor and thought thus far has been greater than is yet generally conceded, we are but now laying foundations calculated to produce scholarship and advantages equal to our task. The

struggle for a place in the church called for no uncertain metal. The metal the fathers proved. It has been a prolonged conflict, marked by undeviating conviction of the integrity and divineness of the cause of impartial love and infinite wisdom. A century of contumely, humility, faith, courage, has led us to victory. But with a hundred years of distinctive history, and a place firmly secured within the conceded boundaries of the Christian Church, we find ourselves face to face with new advantages and duties, as well as with new dangers and struggles.

In view of this fact, we have been led into this digression to note what is only incidental to the object of our paper, viz.: Our enlarged power and successes call for the completest intellectual advantages and training of our young men and women who are coming to bear on the work begun in the first century of the Universalist Church. Our name, fortunately, has a meaning. It has power and distinctness. If it is dogmatic, all the better, if it be the symbol of truth; certainly all the better if it stand for error, since an error is never so well exposed as when uncovered and fully asserted. But love is dogmatic, and God makes the rainbow of positive colors, and paints the morning and evening with no uncertain rays. On presumption of the substantial correctness of our faith in God and man, it is our advantage now that the fathers took a name so truthful to themselves, and with so great affirmative power. It speaks aggressive force and purpose with persistent, leavening action. Universalism is indeed nothing to the age or world unless aggressive, and fired with the zeal of the reformer and missionary. But we return.

While attempting no exhaustive analysis of the characteristics of a successful ministry, we shall select and treat a few of its necessary conditions. Take a group of preachers of to-day, who are eminently successful, and we shall doubtless be first impressed with the variety of intellectual and spiritual characteristics among them. We shall be arrested by the prominence of their special gifts and their specialties of labor in thought and deed. Take Beecher, Clarke, Chapin, Bushnell, Simpson,

Park, Storrs, Miner, Tyng, Bellows — men of commanding influence and large power of thought and spirit, as Christian ministers. What diversity of gifts! No two of them are so very like in mental traits that we could say: Here are two oaks; here are two elms. Yet each throws his shadow across the life and pathway of our religious history and progress.

We do not call particular attention to these men as our sole tests of success in the ministry. In the measure of their immediate influence and success, they are exceptional. Doubtless there are men of less popular notoriety, who are achieving successes which the Church shall longer realize, if we except two or three among them. They serve our purpose, however, in two ways: in diversity and unity. They exhibit the marked variety of gifts which finds place in the ministry of Christ.— There are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit. They are many members, yet but one body.

In this variety, what is there in common? What like conditions exist with these variously endowed minds and ministers, without any one of which either of them would have proved a failure in the Christian ministry? We think our question not unsuited to the need of the times. Evidently, for those now preparing for the office of the pastor and preacher, and for those just entering that office, the inquiry is peculiarly pertinent. Its answer is not so readily shaped in positive form as many may be inclined to think. Many-sided human nature refuses to be measured and tried for settled answers to any question by the rules and tests which one or a score of men with never so wide a range of observation and insight may hold. However, our question, relating to a particular office and calling, has certain clearly-defined outlines, which bring all men concerned within the range of a common judgment. For, while the ministry of Christ gives widest scope for the play of the highest powers of human nature, still, when its direct objects are considered, and its necessary fundamental conditions of success are examined, we are struck with their simplicity and distinctness.

A few words here in connection with the eminent men we

have named. When we ask young men to consider what is common with them, they will not understand us as advocating the folly of imitation. One important aim in directing attention to the diversity and unity of such is to show how they are never imitators, but are builders on the foundations God laid in their brains and hearts. Know ye not that ye are the temple of God? These men, in whom dwell Christ's spirit and purpose, are God's temple—a temple with what varied, yet, in its wholeness, what harmonious architecture! Nature's variety of outline is reflected in man's nature. Rather Nature is perfected in the higher greatness and scope of the human mind. The grandeur and architecture, the loneliness and majesty, the clear atmosphere and inspiring power of the Alps, the Sierras, the White Hills, are they not realized in higher types in the loftiness and varied outlines and power of minds here and there uplifted on the horizon of our common life? We can all verify the philosopher's words, that: "A profound nature awakens in us by its actions and words, by its very looks and manners, the same power and beauty that a gallery of sculpture, or of pictures, addresses." These natures, in that which is unique, may be studied; they cannot be copied. Nor, as we shall find, are the essential qualifications for the ministry subjects of imitation. They may be, it is true, true sometimes in fact, assumed, but they are too fundamental not to be felt and recognized by the world when existing; while their assumption, for the same reason, is too difficult to be long a success.

The examination of our question has led us to reduce the necessary conditions or laws of a successful ministry to four: Conviction, Purpose, Courage, Insight. We are not oblivious to the possibility of still further reduction of terms. We stop, however, with the above, for the purpose of greater explicitness of detail. We shall aim to show that any marked success in the ministry is due to the power arising from the combination of these states and faculties of mind. It will be noted that conviction and purpose are states of mind, while courage and insight are constitutional.

Let us again call to mind that great intellects and learning are not absolute essentials. While contributing vastly to it in a cultivated community, provided conviction, purpose, courage and insight go with them; still, very ordinary intellects, with quite ordinary learning, may do incalculable service in the name of the Master. This is a reason, too, why, as earlier stated, questions of intellect and learning pertain to the variables, and not to the constants of the Christian ministry. The same, too, is true of questions of the *personnel*, the address, voice, the sensuous endowments, or defects, which in one case so largely aid, in another retard, the minister's success, but which as endowments do little for the preacher unless the essentials named lie behind them, while as defects they do not produce failure when the essentials of mind and heart are pronounced.

What is success in the Christian ministry? The maintenance and diffusion of the truth and life in Jesus Christ — the increase of the following of Jesus. For some, this answer only provokes a new question: What is signified by the truth and life in Christ? This creed, or that? We do not open that question here. Speaking for no creed or sect, as such, but seeking a generalization inclusive of essential faith in the Church universal, we reply: The truth and life in Christ signify, as concerns himself, his unparalleled eminence and authority as spiritual Teacher, Master, Revelator and Saviour of men; as concerns preacher and follower, their righteousness and devotion to God and man under the inspiration and leadership of this Son of God. The maintenance and diffusion by the preacher of conviction and life based thus in Christ, we count success. The Christology of preachers may range from that of Augustine to that of a T. J. Sawyer, or J. F. Clarke. Christ as God; preexistent Angel, first in rank of finite mind, or Man perfected in Divine illumination, ever highest Authority or Source of required light to educate the world Godward.

Emerson counts success a constitutional trait. This is true, if we regard the selection of our profession or work as determined by a gift for it. The gift in that case secures success.

But, if success in the ministry is constitutional, conviction and purpose are not essential conditions, since they are not constitutional, but signify states of mind. It is certain, however, their strength depends upon constitutional traits. But success, as we contemplate it, relates to the support of a particular course, the filling of a particular office. Conviction and purpose are hence imperatives of success, as ship and canvass, steam and compass, are for the progress of navigation.

Emerson affords us an illustration. His constitutional traits of mind secure him easy pre-eminence in transcendental philosophy. He has gifts calculated to make him one of the first of the apostles of Christianity. But he who began work in the Christian ministry turned from it because of a failure in conviction. To him, Christ is not more, but less than nature — nature with him embracing man. A religious genius, Christ is a fraction, the largest fraction, not the all-ensphering inspiration and authority. Hence Emerson, properly enough, if correct in conviction, properly at all events in obedience to his personal conviction, turns from special emphasis of the less, to the reading and interpretation of the greater. Lack of success as a Christian minister in his case was owing, not to constitutional defects, but to the want of essential conviction concerning the place and mission of Christ. We confess, however, the world is the gainer by his change from the special priesthood of the Church to that of nature. Through him the law and life in nature and history have profounder and clearer utterance than in any poet or philosopher. We can see farther into the law and life of Christ from pondering his pages, while we do not forget, nor fail to see, that his thought is of one reared under Christian influence and culture. Emerson's attempts to embrace universal religion, to generalize the sentiment of all ages, to read from the law and life of his own soul, the history of all thinking, doubting and faith, are certain to yield, under his profound insight and faithfulness to nature, large measures of thought and spirit and inspiration, in harmony with the radical law and life of Him who is the Prophet and Exemplar of the religion for humanity. All truth, in na-

ture and human passion, sentiment and thought, of all ages, finds expression and interpretation in one who, like Jesus, embodies and reflects the highest truth and life. The greater contains the less.

Relative, then, to the special office of the Christian ministry, we see clearly that that which makes of James Freeman Clarke a Christian minister is, at the point we now occupy, his conviction of the religious Mastership of Jesus Christ, while that which takes an Abbott from the same is the loss of such conviction. Let us, then, consider more definitely, conviction, as the first of the qualifications of the successful ministry of Christ.

It divides into two kinds: intellectual and moral. To be in readiness, as Paul declares himself to the Romans, to preach the Gospel, there must be with all alike a profound conviction of the paramount claims and mission of Jesus as a *Revelator* and a Leader in spiritual things. This is an intellectual state, and may possibly, for a brief time, exist with slight moral conviction — slight corresponding excellence of life. If it so exist, so far, well. While thus, however, though a prime essential, it is but half. The full condition includes a union with spiritual conviction — an awakened religious life. Intellectual conviction alone may produce an argumentative preacher, an expounder of texts by superficial estimate of similar words drawn up in battle to check-mate each other, a good police on the wayward flights of young men of mettle, yet show conclusively marked poverty of the spirit and life, which bring one to fellowship with Christ. Spiritual conviction here is the feeling and confession of the personal service of Christ in things of the spirit, and so an apprehension and appreciation of the needs of every man. These combined convictions about Christ and self and the world through self, raise one to the proper condition, thus far, to preach his Gospel. We use the term conviction as a stronger word than belief, signifying a strong, persuasive, belief. Without conviction of this two-fold stamp, we fail to see how any one can truthfully rank as a Christian minister. Certain failure follows its want, or loss.

Some one says, "Breathe into a man an earnest purpose, and you awaken in him a new power." Intellectual and moral conviction of the truth, life and need of the Christian religion makes a Christian, but not necessarily a preacher. For this is needed purpose.

Charged with a great purpose, we discover new power in ourselves, and the ability to awaken power in others. With a purpose, we are changed from passive and potential to affirmative and active men. Purpose concentrates our forces, mobilizes our unemployed reserves, and draws our supplies to the point in need. It makes captains of us all. By it we overcome the impetuosity of impulse and seek our cooler judgment of place and time for guidance. We thus shun the evil of dissipating our power, and double that power through the prudence of concentration. Impulse is good, only master and steady it. "Natures with great impulses have great resources, and return from far," says the seer of Concord. But impulse is a Cyclops, has one eye only, sees one thing at a time, and makes for it direct. There are in certain crises great power and service in that, it is true; but human nature cannot be thus habitually handled, or it will show you greater power in resistance. A high purpose, in reform and religion, is demanded. Noble impulses point this way, but they require some defined object and control, if their greater uses are to be economized. This is a lesson woman has specially to learn, as she goes with her impulsiveness into the hand to hand conflicts of politics, commercial and professional life. If, in this sphere of activity, the world needs her more infallible insight and moral directness, she will find her need of man's consecutiveness and patience in dealing with the intricate problems and details of affairs and reforms.

Diligence, one will say, characterizes, in common, successful men, and should be named in our catalogue of neccessities. We imply this, and such virtues as persistence and earnestness, in the term purpose, backed by conviction. For purpose, with such support, makes even a weak man into an affirmative man; and affirmative men sway the world. Purpose in-

spires diligence and earnestness, while there may be great diligence, marked earnestness, and a man prove a failure for want of distinctive purpose to concentrate otherwise wasted power. In the matter before us, that is the important and all-containing term, which expressess most fully the orderly excitement of the affirmative force in man, in the preacher. Maintenance and security of the territorial integrity and honor of Prussia unite Germany. Here is a purpose inspiring preparation and resources and armies enough to crush an empire.

The governing purpose of all successful Christian ministers is the maintenance and increase of righteousness by the preaching and diffusion in character and word of the truth and life in Christ. We recall that righteousness is maintained and increased in manifold ways. It is not a work circumscribed by the particular office of preacher and church. But the ministry has a special office in its interest — one, perhaps, more than any other, immediately concerned in its sources of power as springing from Jesus Christ. All aids and other sources of righteousness and spiritual enlightenment will be freely used by the ministry, if enlarged wisdom prevails. Hospitality of mind to truth and help, from all sources, characterizes the ministry, wheresoever bigotry is supplanted by liberal education and enlarged insight and faith.

If the special purpose of the ministry is the good of man through the truth and life in Christ, then the measure of its success depends upon the directness, vividness and efficacy with which the preacher moves men with that truth and life. Hence the varying degrees of success. But, great or small degrees, success in a distinctive Christian minister means this drawing of the world to Christ — this awakening of the Christ-life and Christ-mind in men. Drawing men to the supreme good in any or all other men, religions and philosophies, is well. But that is not half way, at the highest, to the fullness of supreme good in Him whose soul, by its divine illumination, dwarfs all other revelators. The world may enjoy and thrive to certain stages in its progress on half ripened fruits; but when the ripened fruit arrives, though taste may be imperfect,

both its fragrance and beauty attract, and the soul's taste grows to the relish of the divinest. The logic of Emerson's philosophy, his brilliant exposition of spiritual laws, the instincts and intuitions of the soul he so marvellously depicts, the very fate in nature and the human heart he so dwells upon, will give peoples and humanity to Christ, take them by sages of India, Greece, Rome, Europe and America. They do well as way-stations; the dèpot of spiritual power and wisdom for the world's fullest life and good, is in Christ.

We have found two things common to ministerial success: conviction of the truth and life in Christ and the purpose to establish the same among men. Had we sought to reduce the conditions of success to the lowest terms, we should have named conviction and purpose alone. They imply courage and insight. But having somewhat of practical value to add, we consider courage and insight as independent conditions of success. Insight discovers ends and resources; courage is executive.

All eminently successful ministers of Christ have, of necessity, been men of positive moral courage. The fire of the old prophets and apostles burned anew in their breasts. Gifted men have gone down before the vice and oppositions of times, where the courage of a Paul, a Savanarola, a Luther, would have triumphed. All affirmative movement, all conflict, resistance, days of darkness and doubt, all intricacies of plan and execution, demand courage, or the man is defeated, so to speak, before the endeavor. We have called it a constitutional trait. Emerson so regards it. Doubtless men are born to courageous deeds; but there is in the courage, as rated by the average of the world, something physical. This is oftenest credited. It depends on the vivacity of temperament, the flow of the blood. It is brute courage. Men are born to this, as the lion or the dog is. Nor do we deny to men the pre-eminence of moral courage by virtue of birth. But, if this means that men of marked deficiency of moral courage are, under fate, bound down to cowardice, we do not so understand human nature. This would affirm that a cowardly Peter could not be raised to

a moral hero. It would deny that which the Christian religion, by its every word and divine spirit, addressed to all men, assures us as real in humanity: power in every soul to make a moral hero; its mission being to touch and awaken the native greatness and spiritual determination; to open the eyes of the strong angel in us all and give him command, and, then, no man fears the world, darkness, or death. From this point of view, evidently, courage depends for awakening upon conviction. Conviction is born of insight and knowledge. Spiritual discernment is presupposed in all acknowledgment and following of Christ, or any moral good. Experience, springing from this seeing, is knowledge. What the soul thus sees and knows is thenceforth supported by a courage that makes martyrs. Generalizing from Plato's doctrine of the supreme good being the reality, Emerson says: "Courage is nothing else than knowledge." This is that moral heroism which relies upon its grasp of the truth and the good as certain prophecy of victory. It says: I know that my Redeemer liveth, and so all dangers are but occasions for the demonstration of superior power.

If a preacher of Christ dare not declare and stand by His truth and spirit under whatever ordeal, he may well question his conviction, and retire for men who believe and feel, and feel because they believe, and, therefore must speak. Burke said of England, when resisting the policy of Fox toward the French Revolution: "She is proud and strong, and strong because she is proud." The successful ministry is ever a believing and courageous body of men, and courageous because believing.

Insight is the master faculty of the religious and philosophical mind. It is clear what is meant when we say, after a study of Herbert Spencer: He fails in moral insight; or after a study of James Martineau: His insight is extraordinary. It rises into an immeasurably important fact in human history that only men of profound insight take lead in successful religious movements. Spencer takes us over lines in the *rationale* of the universe that sometimes impress us with awe and stifle

us with atmosphere not unlike that which overcame Dante following Beatrice. Not that he makes the universe an Inferno, but that he strikes the supreme Reality of spiritual being so often from our thought and hope. Spencer, however, makes us think, and that is a grand mission to fill, while he is, in much, an unequaled intellectual light. Martineau inspires both thought and vision, instructs and guides the preacher and student of religion and philosophy. He can embrace all Spencer discloses, and infinitely more — the permanency and reality of a spiritual universe.

The Christian preacher will succeed in teaching and saving in the ratio of his insight, coupled with the power of arousing discernment in others. Insight is plainly a variable quantity among men, but a certain good degree of it must manifestly characterize all successful ministers of Christ. It is, in fact, an inexorable condition of any man's thorough acceptance and entrance into the life and heaven of Jesus. The least of spiritual things is known to us only by it. If its eye is closed, materialism and a godless intellectualism alone remain to us. We speak of it as a constitutional trait, as we did of courage. We mean constitutional with human nature, while exceptional in high degree with individuals. We say of it, as of courage, it is potential in all minds. Otherwise, remembering it as a necessary condition of laying hold of spiritual things, we hazard the possibility of even God drawing all souls to himself; at all events, we should deny the moral philosophy, or spiritual law announced by Paul, that spiritual things are spiritually discerned, which is the same as declaring that spiritual discernment is a fixed condition of receiving and realizing the truth and life in Christ. This constitutional trait of human nature has far more significance in determining the controversy about the ultimate destiny of souls than has yet been conceded to it. It brings us to this: that salvation is primarily a question of seeing. Emerson, following the Platonic philosophy, says: "Do you love me? is the same as asking, Do you see the same truth with me?" There is divine law and necessity in that. It is the Christ-mind that puts us in Christ's company. The awak-

ening of the spiritual nature of man is the new birth. Says Jesus: Except a man be born again he cannot *see* the kingdom of heaven; and again, he cannot *enter* the kingdom of heaven. If science proves all material things under invariable law, no less is the spiritual universe. It comes to this, therefore: Insight potential in all minds,—Human nature capable of progress, of improvement in seeing and knowing,—God, with all spiritual forces, directing attention and influence and aid upon every soul. Every eye shall, therefore, sometime open in this surrounding glory and divinity of being. Once to see it is to love it, and enter into it, till it fills us all in all.

We know not how it may be, but maintaining like faculties in all minds, we do not affirm that even eternity will bring about equality in gifts of spirit. We only think how diversity of gifts may continue among us hereafter, as here, while each mind, endowed like every other in kind of vision and power, shall follow or lead, as the case may be, in similar paths of knowledge and life and happiness. Martineau may always, in a future life, as in this, apprehend more fully the moral agencies of the universe than Spencer; while Spencer, not far behind Martineau, by and by may, however, still display his other gifts in subordination to the one which makes him to-day the marked and exceptional man he is. Three friends sitting in converse on future life, give each his and her desire of what heaven may yield. One looks forward to the opportunities of personal knowledge of the grandeur and diversities of the universe. Another to the society of Plato, Paul and Christ. The other to the complete sense of being forgiven of all sin. We think the heaven of each shall be realized, while the heaven of each shall be open to all.

A notable want of insight in one who undertakes the work of preaching Christ to a world where sorrows alternate with joys, guilt with virtue, doubt with faith, darkness with light, must inevitably fail of any appreciable success. The average mind and heart of society prove dumb to one yet dumb on things they most need; one blind where vision is demanded to point the ways through which beauty, love and life are inhaled of God, and exhaled in thought and deed.

We have considered conviction, purpose, courage and insight as essential conditions of the succcessful Christian minister. It may be asked, May not a man have all these qualifications in due degree, and still fail? We have taken for granted at least a fair degree of intellect and physical fitness in the preacher for these conditions to rest in and spring from. With even an ordinary foundation, then, with these conditions, we can only look for a successful ministry in some of the many varied fields of labor human society ever offers, with harvests ripe for the husbandman. Let one of these conditions, however, be wanting, or lost, and the defective preacher, whether great or small in other gifts and cultures, fails, as certain as his body when the pulse stops.

Article XIX.

Our Three-Fold Life.

The life of man is the strangest mystery the world affords. Not more mysterious is the globe itself, than is this, its incomprehensible inhabitant. Standing at the head of the animal creation, his are powers beyond all others; his latent capacities seem to be infinite. Yet no one, thus far, has solved the singular problem of life — has told what it is, or whence it proceeds, whether in man or in the inferior races. Here we touch the primal mystery. We see all around us activity, motion, organized bodies endued with life; but whence this is, we cannot tell, neither can we tell what it is. Certain phenomena are patent to the senses, as the seed, containing the hidden germ; the gradual unfolding and development of that germ; the steady growth and subsequent decay of the body produced; and we say, all this is governed by law; and the law of development, to a certain extent, we are able to trace. But this does not account for life itself; it does not tell us what it is, nor whence it proceeds. All here is mystery, and a mystery

which at present remains insoluble. If the highest efforts of human genius for thousands of years have stumbled and faltered at the threshold of this inquiry, well may we regard the solution of the problem as beyond the reach of our finite capacities. It is a hidden thing, which belongs to God.

It may seem to some derogatory to admit that there is anything which man cannot comprehend; and a certain class of self-styled "philosophers" go so far as to assert that nothing should be believed which cannot be proved, — forgetting entirely that the highest proof is the fact itself. No man can prove his own existence: that is impossible. It is a simple fact, which we are compelled to admit as the basis of all reasoning. The very attempt to prove anything, assumes the existence of him who proves. Hence, the proof of life is the fact itself; and that fact we are obliged to assume. Whether with man or the inferior races, or in any department of creation, we assume the existence of what we see; and we can have no higher proof than the fact.

But we do not propose to deal with abstractions, nor to enter upon discussions which bewilder and perplex more than they instruct. The greatest lesson which man can learn is that of his ignorance, and the mystery of life. Yet no subject appeals to us with profounder interest, and no one attracts more general attention, than this of life, whether in its origin or in its varied phenomena. It seems to have for us a peculiar fascination — a charm, which we find ourselves powerless to resist. And the principal distinction between man and man is the degree of attention he has paid to this theme, even if we admit that the attempt to solve it in all its fulness has hitherto failed: for the moment a man neglects himself he begins to descend in the scale of existence; he sinks to the level of the brutes, his companions; nay, falls below them, in intelligence and capacity. "Know thyself," was the motto engraved upon the ancient temple; and a modern poet has truthfully said that "the proper study of mankind is man."

We propose simply, in the present paper, to call attention to a few of the varied phenomena of life, so common that all

must have noticed them, and yet so mysterious that we can only recognize without accounting for them. Their existence is too evident for any one to deny; and yet he would be indeed daring who should assert that they are perfectly intelligible or perfectly explicable..

Take first the body itself. We are indeed "fearfully and wonderfully made;" and what physiologist will attempt to explain the recondite mysteries of bodily life? What causes the heart to beat? the lungs to play? the brain to act? We recognize these facts, but we cannot account for them — we cannot explain them satisfactorily. When our attention is called to ourselves, we detect these phenomena in ceaseless action. By day and by night, awake or asleep, these involuntary motions continue, but how or why, we cannot tell. We know, too, that at death, — so far, at least, as the body is concerned, — all these motions are suspended and cease; all is still with once what was so full of life. And when this life is suddenly crushed; when, by some great and terrible disaster — a railroad collision or the loss of a steamer — scores are swept at once from existence, what a feeling of awe pervades our souls, and how deep is the mystery which seems to enfold us! We see the child playing around us in all the gleefulness natural to youth, and a few days after, its little body is stiff and cold. We see the maiden, buoyant with health, the stalwart man, engrossed in business, the anxious mother, caring for her little ones; to-morrow, they have passed away. We see the old, trembling and tottering on the verge of the grave; and they, too, disappear. We bury our dead away from our sight; we deposit their bodies in the silent tomb, and there they moulder and crumble to dust: what has become of the life which endued them? Whither has it fled? That they are gone from us forever — are annihilated, lost — we cannot believe; but certain it is, that here, at least, "the place that knew them once shall know them no more." They are dead, we say. But what is death? Is not that as mysterious as life? And is it anything more than a phase of life?—life itself being eternal? Indeed, are not life and death correlative terms, both relating to the same great mystery?

But look once more at this bodily life, for it has greater mysteries than those to which we have referred. Physiologists speak of a nervous fluid pervading the body, called by some the *odic* force, which seems to be the fountain of animal life: it is this that stimulates all to action. But what this is, no one can tell. It has never been seen, nor can it be accurately described. Its existence is assumed, from the phenomena it presents: and we do not doubt the fact of its existence. But what a field of mystery it opens before us! It pervades every particle of the animal frame — is everywhere present, nowhere absent. Pull out a hair, and you find it in that; stick a pin into the face, the hand, or any part of the body, and you find it there. And yet, singular as it may seem, in certain abnormal conditions of the body it ceases to act, and its presence is unfelt. In catalepsy, for instance, and in certain stages of mesmerism, you may prick with a pin the most sensitive part, without its displaying a nervous contraction. It seems as insensible as if it were wood. What is this change, and how shall we account for it? The very same parts which but a moment since were shrinkingly sensitive, now seem as senseless as stones. Look, too, at the effects of ether. This suspends the normal action of the nervous fluid, and produces partial or complete insensibility to pain, so that the operator cuts the body without extorting a groan from the patient. It is a wonderful fact, but still it is a mystery. We perceive its effects and enjoy its benefits, but why it should act thus, who can tell? What is ether, that it should thus affect our animal life?

And there is another phenomena, no less mysterious, relating to this nervous fluid, which is its susceptibility to development, to an unusual degree, through physical causes, over some of which we have no control. In insanity, for instance, this nervous fluid collects in such quantities as to give to the frailest the strength of a giant. How often have we seen a tender woman, ordinarily feeble, in the delirium of fever displaying a power which seemed irresistible;—able to cope with the strongest man, and baffle his efforts to resist or control?

And may it not be to this source — a disturbance of the healthy action of this fluid — that we are to attribute sudden outbursts of anger, fits of petulance, or the seemingly irresistible propensity to steal, to destroy, even to commit murder? When the child awakes in the morning, peevish and irritable, is it not that its nervous force is enfeebled and sensitive? When respectable men and women, having an abundance of temporal things, become kleptomaniacs, and cunningly secrete things for which they have no use, what is this but a pressure of this fluid upon the organ of acquisitiveness, combined with secretiveness? And may not all crime be traced largely to this source? Is it not a form of insanity?—the perverted action of qualities in themselves originally good. There is no man so good but, in abnormal conditions of the body, he might be led to the commission of crime. Saints have sworn in the delirium of fever, or under the impulse of sudden emotion; tender mothers have killed their babes to conceal their shame.

So, too, in sudden emergencies, there is a development of this fluid which gives to us an extraordinary accession of energy, which enables us to do what would otherwise be impossible; to lift weights, which ordinarily we could not start; to leap chasms which would ordinarily be impassable, or to control ourselves when convulsed with emotion. And it is to this unusual stimulus of the nervous fluid that we are indebted for the power which comes to us when it is needed. It is the oil which feeds the flame of life. It seems like a reservoir of boundless capacity, and almost inexhaustible.

It is also to this source that we are doubtless to attribute many of the phenomena of mesmerism and spiritualism, as they are called. There are a thousand things which affect the nerves and determine their action. The physical contact of living or dead bodies, organic or inorganic; a touch of the hand or a glance of the eye; inhaling nitrogen, or exhilarating gas; indulgence in stimulants of different kinds — spirituous liquors, opium, tobacco, strong tea or coffee; certain poisons, as arsenic, belladonna, digitalis, strychnine, cannabis Indica; the food we eat, the clothes we wear, the air we breathe, the

state of the weather, different degrees of heat or cold, wetness or dryness, our mental condition, the movement of our passions, the state of our health; nay, more subtle and mysterious forces, unrecognizable by the senses, but none the less real; all these, and a thousand other things — electricity, galvanism, sun, moon, stars, affect the nerves, and increase or reduce the amount of this fluid which circulates in the body.

Man is a living and sensitive battery, and all the phenomena of the universe affect him. There is an aurora, an atmosphere, constantly around him, invisible to his senses, which we cannot describe, but upon which everything impinges and acts. If a friend speaks to me, or even a stranger, I hear his voice, and it acts at once upon the nervous fluid, conveying to the mind certain sensations; if he breathes upon me, I feel his breath, and that, too, acts on this fluid; and so if he touches, or even looks at me, out of his eye there flashes a light which stirs in an instant this mysterious fluid, and it may so dazzle as to cause me to shrink. Hence it is that we cast our eyes involuntarily down when we meet others in walking the street; hence it is that the presence of some excites pleasurable, while the presence of others excites painful, or repulsive emotions; hence it is that a friend announces his coming beforehand by the contact of atmospheres surrounding us severally, and our peculiar impressibility at the moment of contact; hence it is that the same thought arises simultaneously in the minds of persons, seated together or far apart; and hence it is that mind acts on mind at distances quite remote, and, apparently, incredible, as when impressions of death or threatening danger to a distant friend are conveyed across the pathless ocean or vast tracts of the earth's surface, in the form sometimes called "premonitions," — by the Scotch "second sight," and by others "clairvoyance." But we are touching here upon another department, upon which we may speak more fully hereafter.

Coming back, then, to this nervous fluid, we say that it is capable of self-development. We speak often of "nervous persons," meaning by this, persons of a nervous, susceptible tem-

perament. But all are nervous to a certain extent; and the amount of this nervousness may be indefinitely increased, until it becomes uncontrollable. Stimulants, as we have said, affect the nerves; so do the passions; so does the state of our bodily health; disease is but a disturbance of its normal functions. But there is another phase no less striking. Thus, it is possible for any one, by continuous effort, or concentrated thought, to produce an abnormal excitement of his nerves; and under the influence of this excitement, the person is transformed, and powers are unfolded which are ordinarily weak or entirely dormant. He can even speak in unknown tongues, drink deadly draughts without being poisoned, and become clairvoyant, so as to describe persons and events distant and invisible to the natural sight. Hence it is that at camp-meetings, under the excitement which prevails at such places, strong men and delicate women are driven to distraction, or thrown into trances, with their bodily powers convulsed or paralyzed, and in this condition they say and do things which they would not ordinarily say or do. And as all the nerves pass through the base of the brain, and that is the seat of animal passion, it is hence that many develop a propensity to sensual indulgences, exceedingly remote from spiritual life. Nearly all the violent spasms of religious revivals affect more largely the senses than the soul; and hence the reason why so many "fall from grace," — an article which few of them ever possessed.

And by a similar law, we may work ourselves up to a state of excitement bordering upon insanity, and almost incontrollable. Brooding over an insult arouses our anger until it passes beyond the bounds of reason, and becomes a fierce, destructive impulse. Indulgence in eating pampers the appetite, and intense sensuality or gourmandism is the result. So, too, as all that we do, we do through the aid of our nervous force, the nervous fluid may be so much increased, and so little under the control of the will, as spontaneously, and even without concurrence on our part, to move tables, break dishes, scatter chairs, ring bells, and perform other strange and mysterious freaks. Nay, involuntary motions shall be excited in

the hands, and they shall move independently of the will of the person; or upon the organs of speech, and they, too, shall act. We have seen and felt these phenomena ourselves, and they have been witnessed by others hundreds of times. And it will not do to call them delusions, for they are no more delusions than the light of the sun. We cannot, perhaps, account for them all, nor is it absolutely necessary that we should do so; but in all cases, we believe they may be traced to cerebral excitement, caused very largely by the increase and pressure of the nervous fluid, thus destroying the balance of our powers, and exciting them, for the moment, to preternatural activity. And if this fact were once admitted, it would deprive these phenomena of much of their mystery, and teach us the importance of keeping, so far as possible, the control of ourselves, and to avoid surrendering to such influences. We need all our ordinary force for the performance of the necessary duties of life; and when we depart from our usual course, we find, sooner or later, that all abnormal, physical states are more or less fatal to bodily life, and more or less dangerous to mental health and spiritual growth. The nervous man wears out quickly; and all excitement tends to weaken the physical functions, as well as to disturb the composure of the mind and the serenity of the soul.

But we have strayed in a measure from the path we had marked out in commencing this paper, and have gone more fully into this branch of the subject than we originally designed, led into it almost insensibly by a train of reflections suggested by our inquiry. We return, then, once more, to this bodily life, and to the particular points we wish to elucidate.

This bodily life, what a strange thing it is! Who can begin to comprehend it? How it baffles all our researches! How it stretches into the unknown and infinite! We can only say, in speaking of our race that, "It is God that has made us, and not we ourselves." Hence the mystery that involves and surrounds us, for only God can comprehend his wonderful works. How and why does food nourish us? And why does

the same thing affect differently different persons, so that what is one man's meat is another man's poison? How can we account for these idiosyncrasies? And what is this process of nutrition?—of assimilation and absorption?—selection and rejection?—secretion and excretion? Chemistry may analyse the food that we eat, and tell us it is composed of certain elements, and in certain proportions, and yet the mystery is unsolved; for take those elements in the natural state, and they will not of themselves support the body; they must be combined in some other body, be vitalized there, before they can serve for the nourishment of ours. Hence we can find no substitutes for beef and bread; the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, the fish of the sea, and the fruits of the earth must still continue to nourish and support us. All forms of life seem mutually dependent; and as the lower serve first to sustain the higher, so the higher ultimately become food for the lower. Thus life revolves in a continual circle, perpetually changing, yet ever the same.

Physical life, however, is outward and material. Strange as it is, and incomprehensible, it is, after all, the lowest form of life. Man shares it in common with the brutes, in common with plants, though in different degrees, and he is only raised above his congeners as other and higher forms of life are developed within him. When we look at our own bodies or at the bodies of our friends, they assume to us a strange and foreign appearance, as if they were separate and apart from ourselves. They seem to us vague, shadowy, ghostlike and weird. If we think at all, we know it is not the hand that thinks, or the foot, or the head, but something distinct and apart from these. What thinks, we cannot say; but we acknowledge at once that it is not the body. Cut off the hand, and still we think; cut off the foot, and still we think; but cut off the head, and thought ceases, or appears to, at least. Hence we place the seat of thought in the brain. All the discoveries of modern physiology agree in this — that the brain is the organ of thought — the instrument through which it is visibly manifested. And as the brain is divided into two great parts — the

which at present remains insoluble. If the highest efforts of human genius for thousands of years have stumbled and faltered at the threshold of this inquiry, well may we regard the solution of the problem as beyond the reach of our finite capacities. It is a hidden thing, which belongs to God.

It may seem to some derogatory to admit that there is anything which man cannot comprehend; and a certain class of self-styled "philosophers" go so far as to assert that nothing should be believed which cannot be proved, — forgetting entirely that the highest proof is the fact itself. No man can prove his own existence: that is impossible. It is a simple fact, which we are compelled to admit as the basis of all reasoning. The very attempt to prove anything, assumes the existence of him who proves. Hence, the proof of life is the fact itself; and that fact we are obliged to assume. Whether with man or the inferior races, or in any department of creation, we assume the existence of what we see; and we can have no higher proof than the fact.

But we do not propose to deal with abstractions, nor to enter upon discussions which bewilder and perplex more than they instruct. The greatest lesson which man can learn is that of his ignorance, and the mystery of life. Yet no subject appeals to us with profounder interest, and no one attracts more general attention, than this of life, whether in its origin or in its varied phenomena. It seems to have for us a peculiar fascination — a charm, which we find ourselves powerless to resist. And the principal distinction between man and man is the degree of attention he has paid to this theme, even if we admit that the attempt to solve it in all its fulness has hitherto failed: for the moment a man neglects himself he begins to descend in the scale of existence; he sinks to the level of the brutes, his companions; nay, falls below them, in intelligence and capacity. "Know thyself," was the motto engraved upon the ancient temple; and a modern poet has truthfully said that "the proper study of mankind is man."

We propose simply, in the present paper, to call attention to a few of the varied phenomena of life, so common that all

must have noticed them, and yet so mysterious that we can only recognize without accounting for them. Their existence is too evident for any one to deny; and yet he would be indeed daring who should assert that they are perfectly intelligible or perfectly explicable..

Take first the body itself. We are indeed "fearfully and wonderfully made;" and what physiologist will attempt to explain the recondite mysteries of bodily life? What causes the heart to beat? the lungs to play? the brain to act? We recognize these facts, but we cannot account for them — we cannot explain them satisfactorily. When our attention is called to ourselves, we detect these phenomena in ceaseless action. By day and by night, awake or asleep, these involuntary motions continue, but how or why, we cannot tell. We know, too, that at death, — so far, at least, as the body is concerned, — all these motions are suspended and cease; all is still with once what was so full of life. And when this life is suddenly crushed; when, by some great and terrible disaster — a railroad collision or the loss of a steamer — scores are swept at once from existence, what a feeling of awe pervades our souls, and how deep is the mystery which seems to enfold us! We see the child playing around us in all the gleefulness natural to youth, and a few days after, its little body is stiff and cold. We see the maiden, buoyant with health, the stalwart man, engrossed in business, the anxious mother, caring for her little ones; to-morrow, they have passed away. We see the old, trembling and tottering on the verge of the grave; and they, too, disappear. We bury our dead away from our sight; we deposit their bodies in the silent tomb, and there they moulder and crumble to dust: what has become of the life which endued them? Whither has it fled? That they are gone from us forever — are annihilated, lost — we cannot believe; but certain it is, that here, at least, "the place that knew them once shall know them no more." They are dead, we say. But what is death? Is not that as mysterious as life? And is it anything more than a phase of life?—life itself being eternal? Indeed, are not life and death correlative terms, both relating to the same great mystery?

But look once more at this bodily life, for it has greater mysteries than those to which we have referred. Physiologists speak of a nervous fluid pervading the body, called by some the *odic* force, which seems to be the fountain of animal life: it is this that stimulates all to action. But what this is, no one can tell. It has never been seen, nor can it be accurately described. Its existence is assumed, from the phenomena it presents; and we do not doubt the fact of its existence. But what a field of mystery it opens before us! It pervades every particle of the animal frame — is everywhere present, nowhere absent. Pull out a hair, and you find it in that; stick a pin into the face, the hand, or any part of the body, and you find it there. And yet, singular as it may seem, in certain abnormal conditions of the body it ceases to act, and its presence is unfelt. In catalepsy, for instance, and in certain stages of mesmerism, you may prick with a pin the most sensitive part, without its displaying a nervous contraction. It seems as insensible as if it were wood. What is this change, and how shall we account for it? The very same parts which but a moment since were shrinkingly sensitive, now seem as senseless as stones. Look, too, at the effects of ether. This suspends the normal action of the nervous fluid, and produces partial or complete insensibility to pain, so that the operator cuts the body without extorting a groan from the patient. It is a wonderful fact, but still it is a mystery. We perceive its effects and enjoy its benefits, but why it should act thus, who can tell? What is ether, that it should thus affect our animal life?

And there is another phenomena, no less mysterious, relating to this nervous fluid, which is its susceptibility to development, to an unusual degree, through physical causes, over some of which we have no control. In insanity, for instance, this nervous fluid collects in such quantities as to give to the frailest the strength of a giant. How often have we seen a tender woman, ordinarily feeble, in the delirium of fever displaying a power which seemed irresistible;—able to cope with the strongest man, and baffle his efforts to resist or control?

And may it not be to this source — a disturbance of the healthy action of this fluid — that we are to attribute sudden outbursts of anger, fits of petulance, or the seemingly irresistible propensity to steal, to destroy, even to commit murder? When the child awakes in the morning, peevish and irritable, is it not that its nervous force is enfeebled and sensitive? When respectable men and women, having an abundance of temporal things, become kleptomaniacs, and cunningly secrete things for which they have no use, what is this but a pressure of this fluid upon the organ of acquisitiveness, combined with secretiveness? And may not all crime be traced largely to this source? Is it not a form of insanity?—the perverted action of qualities in themselves originally good. There is no man so good but, in abnormal conditions of the body, he might be led to the commission of crime. Saints have sworn in the delirium of fever, or under the impulse of sudden emotion; tender mothers have killed their babes to conceal their shame.

So, too, in sudden emergencies, there is a development of this fluid which gives to us an extraordinary accession of energy, which enables us to do what would otherwise be impossible; to lift weights, which ordinarily we could not start; to leap chasms which would ordinarily be impassable, or to control ourselves when convulsed with emotion. And it is to this unusual stimulus of the nervous fluid that we are indebted for the power which comes to us when it is needed. It is the oil which feeds the flame of life. It seems like a reservoir of boundless capacity, and almost inexhaustible.

It is also to this source that we are doubtless to attribute many of the phenomena of mesmerism and spiritualism, as they are called. There are a thousand things which affect the nerves and determine their action. The physical contact of living or dead bodies, organic or inorganic; a touch of the hand or a glance of the eye; inhaling nitrogen, or exhilarating gas; indulgence in stimulants of different kinds — spirituous liquors, opium, tobacco, strong tea or coffee; certain poisons, as arsenic, belladonna, digitalis, strychnine, cannabis Indica; the food we eat, the clothes we wear, the air we breathe, the

... different degrees of heat or cold, wetness ... mental condition, the movement of our pas- ... our health; nay, more subtle and mysterious ... sensible by the senses, but none the less real; ... thousand other things — electricity, galvanism, ... affect the nerves, and increase or reduce the ... fluid which circulates in the body.

... living and sensitive battery, and all the phenome- ... universe affect him. There is an aurora, an atmos- ... constantly around him, invisible to his senses, which we ... scribe, but upon which everything impinges and acts. ... speaks to me, or even a stranger, I hear his voice, ... acts at once upon the nervous fluid, conveying to the ... certain sensations; if he breathes upon me, I feel his ... and that, too, acts on this fluid; and so if he touches, ... looks at me, out of his eye there flashes a light which ... an instant this mysterious fluid, and it may so dazzle ... cause me to shrink. Hence it is that we cast our eyes ... involuntarily down when we meet others in walking the street; ... it is that the presence of some excites pleasurable, while ... presence of others excites painful, or repulsive emotions; ... it is that a friend announces his coming beforehand by ... contact of atmospheres surrounding us severally, and our ... peculiar impressibility at the moment of contact; hence it is ... that the same thought arises simultaneously in the minds of ... persons, seated together or far apart; and hence it is that mind acts on mind at distances quite remote, and, apparently, incredible, as when impressions of death or threatening danger to a distant friend are conveyed across the pathless ocean or vast tracts of the earth's surface, in the form sometimes called "premonitions," — by the Scotch "second sight," and by others "clairvoyance." But we are touching here upon another department, upon which we may speak more fully hereafter.

Coming back, then, to this nervous fluid, we say that it is capable of self-development. We speak often of "nervous persons," meaning by this, persons of a nervous, susceptible tem-

perament. But all are nervous to a certain extent; and the amount of this nervousness may be indefinitely increased, until it becomes uncontrollable. Stimulants, as we have said, affect the nerves; so do the passions; so does the state of our bodily health; disease is but a disturbance of its normal functions. But there is another phase no less striking. Thus, it is possible for any one, by continuous effort, or concentrated thought, to produce an abnormal excitement of his nerves; and under the influence of this excitement, the person is transformed, and powers are unfolded which are ordinarily weak or entirely dormant. He can even speak in unknown tongues, drink deadly draughts without being poisoned, and become clairvoyant, so as to describe persons and events distant and invisible to the natural sight. Hence it is that at camp-meetings, under the excitement which prevails at such places, strong men and delicate women are driven to distraction, or thrown into trances, with their bodily powers convulsed or paralyzed, and in this condition they say and do things which they would not ordinarily say or do. And as all the nerves pass through the base of the brain, and that is the seat of animal passion, it is hence that many develop a propensity to sensual indulgences, exceedingly remote from spiritual life. Nearly all the violent spasms of religious revivals affect more largely the senses than the soul; and hence the reason why so many "fall from grace," — an article which few of them ever possessed.

And by a similar law, we may work ourselves up to a state of excitement bordering upon insanity, and almost incontrollable. Brooding over an insult arouses our anger until it passes beyond the bounds of reason, and becomes a fierce, destructive impulse. Indulgence in eating pampers the appetite, and intense sensuality or gourmandism is the result. So, too, as all that we do, we do through the aid of our nervous force, the nervous fluid may be so much increased, and so little under the control of the will, as spontaneously, and even without concurrence on our part, to move tables, break dishes, scatter chairs, ring bells, and perform other strange and mysterious freaks. Nay, involuntary motions shall be excited in

the hands, and they shall move independently of the will of the person; or upon the organs of speech, and they, too, shall act. We have seen and felt these phenomena ourselves, and they have been witnessed by others hundreds of times. And it will not do to call them delusions, for they are no more delusions than the light of the sun. We cannot, perhaps, account for them all, nor is it absolutely necessary that we should do so; but in all cases, we believe they may be traced to cerebral excitement, caused very largely by the increase and pressure of the nervous fluid, thus destroying the balance of our powers, and exciting them, for the moment, to preternatural activity. And if this fact were once admitted, it would deprive these phenomena of much of their mystery, and teach us the importance of keeping, so far as possible, the control of ourselves, and to avoid surrendering to such influences. We need all our ordinary force for the performance of the necessary duties of life; and when we depart from our usual course, we find, sooner or later, that all abnormal, physical states are more or less fatal to bodily life, and more or less dangerous to mental health and spiritual growth. The nervous man wears out quickly; and all excitement tends to weaken the physical functions, as well as to disturb the composure of the mind and the serenity of the soul.

But we have strayed in a measure from the path we had marked out in commencing this paper, and have gone more fully into this branch of the subject than we originally designed, led into it almost insensibly by a train of reflections suggested by our inquiry. We return, then, once more, to this bodily life, and to the particular points we wish to elucidate.

This bodily life, what a strange thing it is! Who can begin to comprehend it? How it baffles all our researches! How it stretches into the unknown and infinite! We can only say, in speaking of our race that, "It is God that has made us, and not we ourselves." Hence the mystery that involves and surrounds us, for only God can comprehend his wonderful works. How and why does food nourish us? And why does

the same thing affect differently different persons, so that what is one man's meat is another man's poison? How can we account for these idiosyncrasies? And what is this process of nutrition?—of assimilation and absorption?—selection and rejection?—secretion and excretion? Chemistry may analyse the food that we eat, and tell us it is composed of certain elements, and in certain proportions, and yet the mystery is unsolved; for take those elements in the natural state, and they will not of themselves support the body; they must be combined in some other body, be vitalized there, before they can serve for the nourishment of ours. Hence we can find no substitutes for beef and bread; the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, the fish of the sea, and the fruits of the earth must still continue to nourish and support us. All forms of life seem mutually dependent; and as the lower serve first to sustain the higher, so the higher ultimately become food for the lower. Thus life revolves in a continual circle, perpetually changing, yet ever the same.

Physical life, however, is outward and material. Strange as it is, and incomprehensible, it is, after all, the lowest form of life. Man shares it in common with the brutes, in common with plants, though in different degrees, and he is only raised above his congeners as other and higher forms of life are developed within him. When we look at our own bodies or at the bodies of our friends, they assume to us a strange and foreign appearance, as if they were separate and apart from ourselves. They seem to us vague, shadowy, ghostlike and weird. If we think at all, we know it is not the hand that thinks, or the foot, or the head, but something distinct and apart from these. What thinks, we cannot say; but we acknowledge at once that it is not the body. Cut off the hand, and still we think; cut off the foot, and still we think; but cut off the head, and thought ceases, or appears to, at least. Hence we place the seat of thought in the brain. All the discoveries of modern physiology agree in this — that the brain is the organ of thought — the instrument through which it is visibly manifested. And as the brain is divided into two great parts — the

cerebrum and cerebellum — so each of these seems to have an office of its own, the former relating to our intellectual, moral and spiritual life, and the latter chiefly to our animal life. Touch the brain, and you touch the life; remove it entirely, and it ceases to act, the body dies. Nay, like the body, of which it is a part, it is affected by all the causes we have named, and by other causes peculiar to itself. The different phenomena we have already described affect the mind as well as the body; but as they are chiefly the result of physical causes, we have referred to them under the head of the body, rather than distinctively under the head of the mind.

We lead daily a two-fold life, and only occasionally are we conscious of the fact. First of all is the life of the body; that all must provide for. We must eat, and drink, and wear clothes, and be sheltered in houses, and warmed by fuel. No process has yet been discovered of living without these things. Without food, we die; without drink, we die; without shelter, and exposed to all the inclemencies of the weather, the body soon perishes and ceases to exist. Hence spring all forms of labor and business — from the necessity of providing for and supporting the body. And so we rise in the morning, don our clothes, and go to our work. We ride in the cars, or in a private carriage, or walk on foot. One wields the plough, another the plane, another the hammer, another the trowel, another the shovel, another the yard-stick, another the pen. Infinitely diversified are human pursuits, filling with activity the marts of commerce, and the haunts of business; delving within the earth, as well as upon its surface; ploughing the sea, as well as the land; travelling in foreign climes, as well as in our own. Who has not, at some time, turned his thoughts to a rapid survey of these various callings, all more or less necessary and important, and all contributing to the life of the body?

And there are other pursuits, less necessary, and some even harmful, followed by thousands for the same end — supporting the body. Thus the actor at the theatre contributes in a measure to our intellectual enjoyment, but we can hardly regard his as a necessary calling, though doubtless filling a place in

the world. But what shall we say of the venders of intoxicating drinks, the keepers of dance-halls and houses of prostitution? Of gamblers, thieves, cut-throats, mountebanks, jugglers? All must live. Even the loafer must eat of the loaf. And so men are hustled about from place to place, from pursuit to pursuit, some laudable, others damnable; and all are restless, eager, striving, never content with what they have, constantly reaching forth for more And all this is chiefly for the body. Sift things down, and you find at the bottom the necessity for food; that compels us to labor and strive. "If any man will not work, neither shall he eat:" such is the law of nature and of God.

But while we are thus providing for the body, we are at the same time leading another and a different life, entirely apart and distinct from the first. How often, in travelling the streets, and looking in the faces of those we meet, do we see the tokens of a life within, entirely distict from the life without, and written upon the features in legible characters! There they are, in bodily form, but talking to themselves with lip and gesture, or far off in dream-land, lost in reverie; the countenance lighted with perceptible smiles, or darkened with ominous frowns; the cheek glowing with fearful rage, or pale with suppressed, yet strong emotion; all evidently afar off from the spot on which they are standing, and apparently unconscious of the presence of the body. We speak sometimes of "absent-minded" persons; but all persons are occasionally absent-minded, lost in reverie, building extensive *chateaux en Espagne*. Run against them, and they hardly notice you; you have to shake them, as you would one buried in the profoundest slumber, in order to recall their scattered senses.

More than half of our time is thus spent in dreaming. We call it "thinking," and sometimes it is so; but it is chiefly dreaming. The man of business, engaged in showing his goods to his customers, does it often mechanically, or with divided attention, for while he is expatiating on the excellence of his fabrics, and their admirable finish, he is, at the same time, regarding in fancy the palatial mansion he hopes soon to erect;

the beautiful garden in which he shall walk; the gay equipage in which he shall drive, and the bountiful repasts he will prepare for his guests. He sees before him the spacious room, brilliantly lighted; the well-spread table, glittering with silver; his smiling wife and prattling children; and he holds delightful converse with them. So, too, the mechanic at his bench, the farmer a-field, the musician at the piano, the master in his schoolroom, the author in his study, the lawyer at the bar, the physician in the sick-chamber, the minister in his pulpit, all are indulging in similar dreams, while outwardly engaged in other pursuits. And thus the two-fold life is constantly kept up, the one interpenetraing and enriching the other. For, were it not for this power of thought — were we doomed to confine ourselves strictly to our calling — life would become a prison, a dungeon, and life's duties a wearisome treadmill. It is the ability to forget our earthly surroundings which lifts us up to a higher sphere.

But more than this. Even as mind is superior to matter, so does thought rule the body. It is not only true that "when we are busily employed, time flies," but it is also true that mental engrossment renders us insensible to bodily wants. The cravings of appetite pass unheeded, and men forget that they have not dined. We are, too, insensible to pain. The languor of disease disappears. The cripple, for the nonce, forgets his crutch; the palsied hand ceases to shake; the blind beggar almost sees; and the battered soldier becomes vigorous and strong. Engrossing thought is the renwal of life; it feeds afresh the flickering flame. And it is even possible, by an effort of will, to suspend for a time the action of causes which are sapping the vitals and threatening the life. Thus the weary traveller, anxious to reach his distant home, and with the fiery fever burning in his veins, will keep in motion till his journey is ended, when utter prostration immediately ensues. Fear and hope kept him up; the fear of falling by the wayside, among strangers; the hope to reach his home and friends. How far all disease might be controlled, or modified, or avoided by preoccupation and excitement of mind, we cannot

say; doubtless to a greater extent than we suppose. And it is equally true that disease can be caused and cured by the imagination: and it has sometimes held the power of death, as well as of life. Fancy is potent, more so than we are aware; and we have known a man in robust health to imagine himself ill, until he really became so. And epidemics spread as often through fear as through contact.

And what pleasure there is in mental improvement?—even in indulging an ardent imagination? Does not the poet live in the scenes his fancy portrays, and become identified with all he describes? And do we not all, when engaged in reading a charming book, step aside from the chimney corner, and follow the lead of our magic guide across the burning, howling desert, over the steep and craggy mountain, adown the swiftly-gliding river, through the deeply-tunneled cavern, along the margin of the lonely lake, or over the wide and boundless prairie? We dive into the dirtiest cellars of the city, mount to the desolate, cheerless attic, enter the halls of pleasure and mirth, feast at the banquet, visit the prison, the hospital, the asylum, plunge into scenes of direst strife, march o'er the battle-field, sit by the sick-bed, walk to the grave, all in obedience to the magic wand which printer's ink imbued with mind waves over us with resistless power. When the name of a stranger is heard, or of some author we have longed to see, we form at once an idea in the mind of his personal appearance, picture him tall or short, stout or thin, of florid complexion or bilious look; and how often the picture proves in the sequel at variance with the reality? So, too, we hold imaginary conversations with ourselves and with others; make speeches to delighted audiences, but no one hears them, nor is there an audible tone; compose music rivaling that of Beethoven or Mozart, and sing songs with far more brilliancy of execution than Parepa Rosa or Christine Nilsson; make discoveries in art or science outdoing those of Humboldt or Agassiz; give advice more excellent than that of "Timothy Titcomb;" censure ourselves, and sit in judgment on past follies with Rhadamanthine rigor and sternness; prescribe rules

for our future guidance far excelling the precepts of Franklin: (but which alas! we are sure to forget in a very short time;) welcome the absent and give them the kiss of fondest affection; bring the dead to life again, and live over the scenes of our earlier days;—all these, and a thousand other things, fancy does every day; they form a part of our inward life.

Indeed, this life of the imagination is often more real to us, and far more significant than the actual labors in which we engage. Say, if you will, it is enervating, weakening; still, it is our life; and if rightly controlled, it is our happiest life. For the life of reality is often distasteful, and rarely inviting. We are compelled daily to meet persons with whom we have no sympathy, and who are sometimes repulsive and even odious to us. We have business dealings with a great many people we would gladly ignore, but there they are, visible entities, and we must bear the infliction as gracefully as we can. And the work of our hands is frequently irksome; we pursue it mechanically, and are glad when it is over, and we are relived from the tedious monotony. As the tired horse joyfully welcomes the period of liberation from the galling saddle and rattling cart, and rolls in luxurious ease upon the verdant sward, so the plodding mechanic or hard-working farmer unbends from his toil at the close of the day, and enjoys his evening meal and pipe. Both have their dreams while engaged in their work, and both rejoice when their toils are ended, and the inward life can rule more fully.

Does not the mother, engaged through the day in household toil, preparing those constantly-recurring and never-ceasing "three meals," washing dishes and clothes, mending dilapidated gowns and coats, or caring for the wants of eager children, does not she find relief when, for a time, she can escape from these toils, and snatch an hour for mental improvement? To catch up the newspaper, or favorite magazine, or glance over the pages of a popular book, renews within her the fountain of life, and furnishes food for subsequent thought; so that, as she resumes her wonted burdens, she repeats some beautiful poem, or chants a verse of some heart-thrilling song,

and rises above her outward condition. And thus her life, monotonous as it is, and little as man would care to accept it, has, after all, its compensations, and is not without its abundant rewards. Women live less in the senses than men; they are more ideal and spiritual than we; and life, to them, is dull indeed, if reduced to the level of drudgery and toil.

But there is still another phase of life, not of the body, and not of the mind; distinct, and superior to either of these. It does not spring from a fervid imagination, neither does it lean on material props. It is deeper, more central, more vital than all — the yearning, mysterious life of the soul. We cannot, in words, describe this life in all its fulness; it is something to be felt; neither can we assign to it definite bounds. We feel it within us, we are conscious of its presence, and are swayed by its power. We assert its existence the moment we speak; it is the I which thinks, and feels, and acts; which bows with reverence before the Invisible, and acknowledges the excellence of all that is good, and just, and true; which melts into tenderest charity and love, makes us unselfish, ready to do and to suffer for others; which instinctively recoils from all that is base, and rebukes us continually for our vices and sins; which rises above the surroundings of earth, and is satisfied only with what is eternal. It is all, in a word, which distinguishes man from the beasts that perish, and lifts him up to companionship with angels and communion with God.

And this life, though often dormant, and hidden beneath the rubbish of sense and the defilements of sin, is none the less real, and none the less sure eventually to be felt. Like everything else, it is susceptible to culture and capable of development. It is but a seed, which has not germinated, or has scarcely begun to move in its husk, waiting for genial rains and warmth to quicken and invigorate it, and cause it to grow. But no man is destitute of the germ. Implanted by God, it never dies; it is immortal, like the Giver; an offshoot, as it were, from the Infinite Soul — the highest and best of God's priceless gifts.

We sometimes say the savage has no soul; and we see little of it in the abandoned drunkard, still less in the senseless

idiot. Yet each of these has a spiritual life, peculiar to his condition, though dwarfed through neglect, or the want of development. The savage trembles in the presence of mysteries; and the "Great Spirit" is as real to him as God is to us. He has his forms of worship and his future paradise. And the poor drunkard feels his degradation, and acknowledges it, when sober; but he is the slave to appetite, and so his soul is doomed to neglect. And as to the idiot, his very helplessness inspires us with pity; and who knows how near God may come to these his weaklings?

There is, then, for all a spiritual life; and where it is active, earnest and pure, it is the source of the highest enjoyment and peace. Independent both of fear and hope, centred in God as the absolute Good, it finds in obedience to his commands all the reward it asks for or seeks. It fears not hell, it courts not heaven. Already it is in the kingdom of God. True, there is a mystery about this life, for the things of the spirit are spiritually discerned. It is secret and sacred to every being. It pervades and penetrates mind and body, making the former instinct with joy, and converting the latter into a holy temple. He who has consciously awakened to this life, and is steadfast in his endeavors to develop and quicken it, has no fears of its annihilation, or that it will ever cease to be his inheritance. His life is hid in Christ with God.

We cannot, indeed, tell exactly where this life begins, nor to what extent it is independent of mental life. Each may have its separate sphere; yet, as they co-exist, so may they also be co-efficient; each may act upon and influence the other. Nay, even more: our mental life seems to be connected more or less closely with the life of the body, or the life of the senses, as it might be called. And so our three-fold life, physical, mental, and spiritual, is inter-dependent and intercommunicable. We look, for instance, upon a beautiful landscape by Poussin, or Claude, or that exquisite painting of Raphael's Madonna; it affects the senses; the eye is delighted; the mind, also, is pleasantly excited, and varied emotions are awakened within it; and if the spiritual powers are properly *cultivated*, they, too, will be moved and inspired. But much

depends upon special conditions, to what extent either class of powers will be affected. Thus, the traveller to the White Mountains finds in their vicinity persons who see no beauty in the hills, no sublimity in their towering summits; who look at them as indifferently as if they were obstructions, and would even be "glad if they were all flat." And of two travellers, gazing upon them, one will see them through the intellect alone, and will be thrilled with delight at their majesty and grandeur, while the other will be moved to silent awe, and will lift up his soul in reverence to God. That this latter is the highest vision, all must concede; and hence the importance of cultivating our spiritual as well as our mental and physical powers. We do not say that every one awakened to spiritual life would be similarly affected by viewing these mountains; that would depend, in some degree, upon the culture of the mind and the culture of the senses. The savage sees beauty in trinkets and baubles which the civilized man has learned to despise. But in civilized lands, how many are more attracted by a highly-colored, sixpenny print than by the finest chromo-lithograph of Prang? Some persons have little or no artistic taste, chiefly because it has not been cultivated. You may refine the senses as well as the intellect; and that refinement is reached largely through the intellect, brought to bear upon material things, and to discriminate between them, — to discern latent, hidden beauty. But when the soul is awakened, and works through the intellect — that being itself refined — and so upon the senses, then the highest refinement is reached — the noblest culture man can know.

The food we eat is partaken of by many with a mere animal relish, — a keen sense of physical enjoyment; and the coarest fare, as train-oil and blubber, are great luxuries to the uncultured Esquimaux, as corned beef and cabbage is a favorite dish with the hardy laborer. But when intellectual refinement begins, man becomes more choice in his food, and seeks for a varied bill of fare, Yet, through the intellect, brought to bear upon the simple process of digestion, man may become a refined sensualist, seeking solely to gratify his palate. Of course, the best culture is not thus sensual; and yet, high culture is

often combined with profound sensuality; and literary men love good dinners, and enjoy seemingly with as keen a relish the "feast of fat things, full of marrow," flowing wines and generous fare, as the "feast of reason and the flow of soul." The former, indeed, in the order of the banquet, precedes the latter, and quite often stimulates and excites it, thus inspiring "thoughts that breathe and words that burn."

But this is not the highest life; were it so, Sardanapalus and Heliogabalus would class with our deities, and Lucullus be raised to the rank of chief saint. When the soul is awakened, and moulds the intellect and guides the senses, then may we say, in the words of the Master, "I have meat to eat ye know not of: my meat and drink is to do the will of Him that sent me." In such case, the body becomes subordinate to the mind, and the mind is directed by our spiritual energies. Hence the widow's crust becomes a feast, the poor man's bread is the bread of life, and "reason's whole pleasure, all the joys of sense," lie not in three words, but in one simple phrase — "spiritual competence." He that hath this hath all. Seeking first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, all things else are added unto him.

Here, then, is our three-fold life: physical, mental, spiritual; each having its appropriate sphere; neither deserving of entire neglect, and all combined, tending to form the perfect man, having *mentem sanam in corpore sano*, and *corpus sanum in spiritu sancto*.

Article XX.

Hugo Grotius.

Among all the great names which adorn the history of the first half of the seventeenth century, there is none greater than that of Grotius. Bacon may have achieved a wider renown, but it is doubtful whether he performed as important a work.

Bacon was the standard-bearer in the great scientific advance of modern times, occupying the most conspicuous position in the march, and yet, after all, knowing but little of the nature of the movement; Grotius stands in the background, the unseen director of one of the greatest revolutions ever effected in the political history of mankind.

This claim will occasion surprise, and yet admits of no denial. Grotius was, beyond controversy, the legislator for the international life of Europe. Before him, in fact, there had been no law of nations. Classical antiquity had no thought nor need of such a system of jurisprudence. To the Greek or Roman, all beyond the bounds of his own nationality were slaves and barbarians. He had no system of morality, even, that applied to the foreigner; much less a code of laws designed to regulate his political intercourse with the nations around him. Wherever the jurisdiction of the municipal law ended, brute force was the only arbiter that remained. With Christianity, however, which was confined to no nation nor municipality, but sought to gather all races around one common spiritual centre, a new order of things became possible. Catholicism established, for the first time, a principle of order and justice governing the intercourse of nations. All through the Middle Ages the Papacy stood a majestic tribunal, regulating the international affairs of Christendom, its power ramifying into every part of Europe, the binding force of its decisions acknowledged by the mightiest sovereigns and the most lawless people. The sacerdotal supremacy thus established, it is true, was a mere despotism, which had no law save a few distorted precepts of Holy Writ; no rule save its own traditions; no policy except the dictates of its own selfishness. And yet, the value of the results that were thereby attained, can hardly be overrated. The social system of antiquity could not be successfully extended beyond the walls of a single city; Catholicism organized a continent. Europe, which before had been only a geographical name, became a fact of history. And by the cementing together of these different nationalities, the foundations were laid upon which the wonderful structure of Modern Civilization has been erected.

But at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the political mission of the Papacy was ended. No longer the arbiter of the destinies of others, it was compelled to struggle for its own existence. One half of Christendom had renounced all allegiance to Rome; the other half was indisposed to grant her anything but an ecclesiastical supremacy. The day in which a Pope might determine, by a single word, the conflicting interests of two great empires, had gone by forever. But with the downfall of this Catholic tribunal, the international interests of Europe seemed destined to return to chaos again. During the six hundred years of the Papal Supremacy, the interests of the different states had become interwoven in relations of the most complicated character, and there was no way of deciding the intricate questions that were daily arising, save by the power of the sword. Europe was convulsed with constant struggles, which seemed likely to prove interminable. Unless there should be a speedy change, the centuries which followed the fall of the Roman Empire would soon repeat themselves in history. The reign of brute force would recommence. Each state of Christendom would stand isolated in barbaric seclusion, meeting its neighbors only in the cruel interests of battle.

In this epoch of approaching anarchy, Grotius appears upon the scene as the founder of international law. He saw that as the Papacy had lost its magisterial power over European politics, there must be adopted in its stead an intellectual tribunal — a system of law of universal validity which should decisively mark out the duties and obligations of the different states of Christendom towards each other. True, there was no legislative power with competent jurisdiction, no congress of nations able to enforce such a system of jurisprudence. The legislation must be the work of a single individual, trusting to the power of his own genius, and the perfection of his work, to render him the law-giver of the nations. His only support must be the reason of mankind; his only authority the universal recognition of those laws of Nature which, to use the words of Grotius, "are so immutable that God himself cannot

change them." This great legislative work Grotius undertook and accomplished with such signal success that his labors have since stood almost without revision. The laws have remained the rules of international polity throughout the civilized world.

We must remember that the work was by no means simply a literary one. It was not a mere compilation of old statutes, a digest of codes that had been in force for centuries before. So far from this, Grotius built from the very foundations. He was compelled to dig out, as it were, from the depths of human consciousness the very first principles upon which a code of international law could be constructed. The age was utterly destitute of the most indispensable prerequisite for such a task. It had not even attained to an established system of ethics. Its morality was a medley of vague and confused notions, drawn from Pagan and Christian sources, sometimes inconsistent, and almost always imperfectly understood. The chief ethical studies were to be found in the books of the schoolmen, scattered through such ponderous and comprehensive tomes as the Summa Theologiæ of Aquinas. And it must be confessed that the scholastic dissertations are hardly valuable as contributions to moral science. They are founded too often on ingenious perversions of Scripture, composed exclusively of the subtle quibbles of a casuistry born of the effort to harmonize the teachings of Catholic theology with the moral sentiments of mankind. In this chaotic condition of moral science, Grotius was compelled to construct a system of his own; and, accordingly, a large part of his great work is devoted to the promotion of an ethical system, upon which the principles of international law can safely rest.

The fact has very strangely been made the subject of censure on the part of thoughtless critics. Grotius has been accused of a confusion of thought, of confounding ethics with jurisprudence. No accusation could be more utterly unfounded. The blending of the two sciences originated from no lack of discrimination, nor in that old scholasticism which was always insanely intent upon writing all knowledge in one system. On the other hand, it was the intellectual poverty of

oppressor than the very name of Aristotle." The same calm, judicial spirit is evinced in his treatment of the schoolmen whom modern thought has been content to despise without comprehending, for these old mediæval philosophers have merits which we have shamefully ignored. Their subtle realistic speculations, which we can only laugh at, have had a deeper and more beneficial influence on the intellectual development of Europe, than all our modern philosophies, from the days of Descartes to those of Hegel. We despise those old thinkers only because we are so foolish as to forget their surroundings. We do not remember, as Grotius did, "that they happened to live in very unhappy times, being altogether ignorant of good arts." And this same attitude of commingled reverence and criticism he maintained even toward the fathers of the church. Even they do not receive his unqualified adherence. He does not dissemble his entire dissent from some of their most cherished convictions; treats in the most cavalier manner their dicta upon the sinfulness of war; expresses very decided doubts concerning the infallibility of a body of men who could so outrage the deepest instincts of a Hollander's nature as to forbid the navigation of the sea! In a word, Grotius, with all his reverence for antiquity, is one of the freest spirits in the republic of letters. He listens with the utmost deference to the opinions of the wise and learned in every age, and yet owns no man as master.

We cannot but think that a more intimate acquaintance with such pages as those of Grotius, breathing in every line a spirit of the profoundest respect for the opinions of those who have gone before, would be of incalculable advantage to the literary guild of the present day. We are living in an age which has achieved remarkable success in some of the lower spheres of human endeavor, and yet an age evincing in many of the noblest essentials of progess, a prodigious stupidity. Chief among the causes of our failure is our want of appreciation for the past, our utter lack of reverence for anything except ourselves and our own performances. Hence the shallow self-conceit of our literature, the grotesqueness of our art, the

the age which demanded that every chapter of law should be preceded by a preliminary one on ethics. The three chapters, for instance, on promises, on contracts, on oaths, seem at first view strangely out of place in a treatise devoted to international law. But when we turn to the succeeding chapter, on the promises, contracts and oaths of sovereign power, we see how indispensable were the preliminary essays on general ethics. As we read, we feel that we have before us the work of a wise workman, who seeks to build upon strong foundations.

Grotius has also incurred another reproach — that of slavish submission to authority; and it must be admitted that the censure seems, upon the surface, to be amply justified. His pages fairly bristle with quotations. Not even the most insignificant position is maintained unless it can be supported by the saying of some philosopher, poet, or theologian of the past. And yet this servile adherance to authority is more apparent than real. Grotius is more self-reliant than he seems. The vast array of authorities is simply, to use his own words, "The testimony of so many and so great witnesses." His own reason is, after all, the supreme tribunal which sifts the varying mass of evidence and makes the final decision. His position toward the wisdom of the past is that of reverence, not of blind submission. He stands equally remote from the servility of the scholastic era, and from the supercilious spirit of modern thought. How wise and just, for instance, his veneration for Aristotle, the typical representative of Greek intellect, the acutest logician within that narrow range by which the Hellenic genius was ever bounded, the profoundest thinker that any age has yet produced! And yet, in spite of his admiration for the great Stagirite, he sees the other side of the picture as clearly as did any of those around him by whom Aristototle was being most loudly denounced. Never have the fatal influences of the Aristotelic rule over the intellect of the Middle Ages been more tersely described than in the words of Grotius: "Only I wish that this principality of his had not for some ages past degenerated into tyranny; so that truth (for the discovery of which Aristotle took such great pains) finds now no greater

oppressor than the very name of Aristotle." The same calm, judicial spirit is evinced in his treatment of the schoolmen whom modern thought has been content to despise without comprehending, for these old mediæval philosophers have merits which we have shamefully ignored. Their subtle realistic speculations, which we can only laugh at, have had a deeper and more beneficial influence on the intellectual development of Europe, than all our modern philosophies, from the days of Descartes to those of Hegel. We despise those old thinkers only because we are so foolish as to forget their surroundings. We do not remember, as Grotius did, "that they happened to live in very unhappy times, being altogether ignorant of good arts." And this same attitude of commingled reverence and criticism he maintained even toward the fathers of the church. Even they do not receive his unqualified adherence. He does not dissemble his entire dissent from some of their most cherished convictions; treats in the most cavalier manner their dicta upon the sinfulness of war; expresses very decided doubts concerning the infallibility of a body of men who could so outrage the deepest instincts of a Hollander's nature as to forbid the navigation of the sea! In a word, Grotius, with all his reverence for antiquity, is one of the freest spirits in the republic of letters. He listens with the utmost deference to the opinions of the wise and learned in every age, and yet owns no man as master.

We cannot but think that a more intimate acquaintance with such pages as those of Grotius, breathing in every line a spirit of the profoundest respect for the opinions of those who have gone before, would be of incalculable advantage to the literary guild of the present day. We are living in an age which has achieved remarkable success in some of the lower spheres of human endeavor, and yet an age evincing in many of the noblest essentials of progess, a prodigious stupidity. Chief among the causes of our failure is our want of appreciation for the past, our utter lack of reverence for anything except ourselves and our own performances. Hence the shallow self-conceit of our literature, the grotesqueness of our art, the

narrow range of our philosophy. In our literature, for instance, what an amazing relief would be such "pedantry" as that of Grotius! How salutary that never-ending search for quotations, that continual finding out how much better the old masters have expressed our best ideas than we ourselves could possibly do! What a blessed antidote to those sickly pretensions to "originality" which so disfigure our literature!

It is true, that something of the judicial spirit of Grotius, his wise appreciation of different modes and eras of thought, must be ascribed to the force of circumstances. He was living very near the boundary line between the two great epochs of Christian civilization. Born a Protestant, he became so alienated from Protestantism as to be able fully to appreciate the peculiar beauties of the Catholic system. Driven an exile into France, the best years of his life were spent amid influences the very opposite of those amid which he had been reared. So all the circumstances of his career tended to develop the native impartiality of his spirit. He came gradually to maintain a sort of "armed neutrality" amid the great conflict which was convulsing Europe. In sympathy both with the past and the present, he was the partisan of neither.

Of course, from a certain standpoint, these remarks are by no means complimentary. In active life, neautrality is rarely a commendable position; partizanship, fiery, intense and bigoted, is the first condition of progress. Under the leadership of such men as Grotius, there would have been no Reformation, but only an era of little pamphlets against the Pope, and of final relapse into the old order of things. This is proven well enough by the individual attitude of Grotius toward the Reformation. From the first, we find him attached to the Arminian wing of the Protestant movement. Now whatever may be said concerning the abstract merits of the great theological controversy between the two parties, it cannot be denied that Calvinism represents, par excellence, the spirit of Protestantism. Arminianism is essentially a compromise; Calvinism goes to the roots and wages deadly war with every essential of the Catholic system. The Papal power, during the time it

was struggling for the possession of Europe, always recognized this distinction. It seems invariably to have looked upon Calvinism as the real essence of the Protestant poison, and upon Arminianism as rather a harmless sort of dilution. Of this diluted Protestantism, Grotius, during his early life, was as earnest a defender as his constitutional vice of impartiality would allow him to be. The Calvinistic party having finally triumphed, he was cast into prison. His crime seems to have been an excessive tolerance and liberality of spirit, characteristics which could only be construed, in those days, as treason to one's religion and country. Escaping from prison, he sought refuge in exile. Living then amid the reactionary influence of the French capital, with the memory of his wrongs still rankling in his breast, he became more and more alienated from the Protestant party. Immersed in the preparation of his great work, he lived the life of a quiet observer, watching with interest the religious struggle that was going on around him, but taking no part in the movement. As his age increased, his indifference to Protestantism grew in equal ratio. The great dream of his life had been that of a Protestant Unity, which should gather the warring sects into one vast organization, harmonizing all differences and quieting all dissensions. Happily for the best interests of humanity, this hope, year after year faded more completely away, amid the increasing strife and jealousies of the Protestant churches. With the fading of this dream, Grotius grew less and less adverse to that Catholic unity, which for so many centuries had ruled over Europe. In 1642, he declared, as his matured conviction, that the Reformation had done more harm than good. He acquiesced in the rightfulness of the Papal authority, gave in his adhesion to the doctrines of celibacy and transubstantiation, and seemed in every way prepared to enter the Catholic communion. And yet he paused before taking the last step. Returning to his native land, he died a Protestant at last, and was buried with almost regal honors by his Protestant fellow-countrymen.

Let no one misconstrue this half-way defection from Protest-

antism and its attendant inconsistencies. It was not the work of a trimmer, a time-server, a man without faith or principle. Grotius at any time could have vastly heightened the splendor of his career by a little judicious time-serving, by yielding somewhat to the relentless prejudices of his age. His fault, if it was one, was that of a nature too scrupulous to thoroughly sympathize with the rough work of a revolution; of a mind too evenly balanced to become the bigoted partizan of any set of ideas, of a temper too gentle not to turn in disgust from the fierce rivalries and endless quarrels of the Protestant sects. His alienation from the religion of his infancy was the inevitable out-come of his nature; and while we may regret it for the sake of Protestantism, we cannot for the sake of Grotius or the interests of mankind. For it was this neutral position, this even balance of mind, maintained amid the tremendous struggles of the age, that rendered him competent for his task. A zealous Protestant or a thorough Romanist could not have accomplished it. For its faithful execution, there was demanded a man who should stand practically aloof from all parties; one of such catholic sympathies as to be able to properly appreciate the most conflicting interests and the most divergent methods of thought. The founder of the law of nations could not be the narrow partizan of any sect or system.

But we must draw our brief essay to a conclusion. As will be readily seen, we have attempted no formal account of either the life or labors of Grotius. We have purposely confined ourselves to those salient features of his career and character which seem best to illustrate his peculiar position in the intellectual history of Europe. We desired especially to direct attention to the great work done by him in behalf of modern civilization. It was his triumph, almost forgotten now, to have successfully conducted Europe from the political régime of the Middle Ages into that of modern times. Instead of the despotism of the Papal hierarchy, he inaugurated the reign of law. Without this happy conception of the law of nations — a thought impossible to antiquity — Europe must, perforce, have returned to the Catholic rule or else to international law.

By its aid the greatest miracle of Christianity has been accomplished. All Europe has been welded together in one social organization, without the help of a military or priestly despotism. To this achievement the history of mankind presents no parallel. Only since the days of Grotius has a continent, thronged with nations of different races and languages, been thus cemented together into a social unity, which never interferes with the political independence of its constituent parts, grants each state the most absolute freedom in the management of its own affairs, and yet insures so familiar an intercourse and so perfect an interchange of sentiment, that not a noble thought is uttered, nor discovery made, nor institution framed, nor great deed done of any kind, which does not make its influence felt from one end of the wide domain to the other.

Article XXI.

Education at Home and Abroad.

Man is born into this world to be educated. Life is his school-term. Forces within and without are his teachers. What his character will be, depends upon how these forces act.

The internal creates thoughts and motives, pushing them into words and deeds. The external binds the mind by laws, customs and conditions.

These forces may be antithetical, or concomitant, or both. Under tyranny, the external holds the sway; under freedom, the internal rules.

As are the teachers, so will be the taught. So, some way, all will be educated.

The Indian, with his skin tattooed, his cheeks stained with red and yellow, and his necklace of bones and feathers, is educated.

The Oriental, in his tawdry silks and liveries, loaded with pearls and diamonds, is educated.

The American, regarding the laws of health, cultivating the mind and filling the soul with the vital wisdom of the Great Teacher, is educated.

In this work mingle the true and the false. The latter caused Louis XVI. to choose his bottle of Burgundy to the rescue of his family and nation. It put the scythe of death into the hands of Napoleon, enabling him to drench eastern lands with blood, from Arctic snows to torrid sands. It induced Mark Anthony to desert his fame and his troops for a passionate hour with Cleopatra. It made Herod, the slayer of the male babes of Judea, and the Pharisees, the crucifiers of Jesus.

False education can no more produce good characters, than a damp, poisoned cavern can grow a forest of trees.

Had there been no other Socrates, Washington, and Lincoln would not have blessed the world. These were born like other men, but education bound their passions, as the crust of the earth does the boiling lava within.

Were children formed with characters perfected, minds enlightened and souls developed, we should have nothing to do in the way of education. But it is far otherwise. This work is left for parents and teachers to do. As they are, so will be their successors. The offspring of pagans will be pagan; those of Catholics, Catholic; those of Protestants, Protestant.

How important, then, that children should be surrounded with the best customs, influences, and instruction! Would we have sweet childhood blossom into noble manhood, manhood ripen into golden age, we must baptize the youthful soul into the richest ideas and the loftiest sentiments.

True education yields after its kind. This is the source of our highest joys. The blessings which we count the dearest, have sprung from it. It is the lever which has raised our nation in the scale of prosperity. It is the instrument which has improved our vast expanse of land, cut it up into states, dotted it with towns and villages, set almost every river to whirling saws and spindles. This is the power that has brought low the mountains, lifted up the valleys, tamed the ocean, guided the fire-horse upon land and sea, and made the lightning news-carrier.

Why is it that New England is the most prosperous portion of the globe, all things considered? Why does it furnish the best exhibitions of useful inventions and artistical skill? All this is due to our system of education.

Cross the Isthmus of Panama, enter the semi-barbarian states of South America. The Amazon was discovered about the time of the Mississippi. States of great wealth have sprung up in all directions through the regions watered by the father of rivers and its tributaries. But the Amazon rolls its floods through dreary woods and lonely vales, unused and undisturbed. The cry of the panther and the war-whoop of the savage, echo in the forest the same as they did fifty years ago. In all that vast country there is scarcely a thriving village, or a refined and truly cultivated family. The cause of this degradation is evident.

Only address nature in the language of art and science, and a response will quickly be given. Knowledge will soon render physical agents servants. Had the red man occupied our land to the present day, its quarries would have slept in their silent beds; its rivers would have moved on uninterrupted; the hills and valleys would still be covered with dense forests.

What is wind, water, or steam worth, until man's ingenuity takes hold of them and applies their power? After this is done, what are they not worth?

Education taught Fulton how to apply steam so as to push his boat up the Hudson. It enabled Morse to convert the lightning into a news-carrier. It perfected the beau-ideal of Powers, so that he could create the Greek Slave. It stimulated the hearts of Tufts, Goddard, Dean, and many other generous men, to give liberally of their means to found and foster institutions of learning. It lifted up the souls of Page, Brown and Mann with such love of teaching that they spent life in improving our free schools.

Since true education is of such value to humanity, it is well for us to review its history and see how it has been regarded. On examination, we are made conscious it has not occupied the position it should. Much of less value has been placed

above it. Men have lacked faith in its power. They have been slow to believe it could suit the mass. The idea has been rife that it could benefit only the few, not the whole. Human thought, laws and institutions have narrowed and limited its influence.

Ancient literature shows it has not held the vantage ground it ought. The smooth lines of Homer and Virgil, the historical facts of Cæsar, Xenophon and Herodotus, the biographical sketches of Plutarch and the dialogues of Plautus, plead not for free thought and the general diffusion of knowledge. In the palmy days of Rome, Athens and Jerusalem, there were no public schools. The privileged classes only were required to be educated in the elementary and higher branches of learning. These thought infinitely more of physical training than of head and heart culture. This discipline was more the work of chance than the result of true philosphy.

The Augustan age was no more favorable to free thought and the general diffusion of knowledge. When its authors refer to free education it is done more in the spirit of satire than approval.

It is also evident that the ancients did not appreciate true education from their treatment of teachers and discoverers. Pythagoras, who lived centuries before the Christian era, was an earnest teacher and wise philospher. He was deeply loved by his pupils; still, the mass looked upon him as an impostor. Socrates, his successor, because he was proving himself a true teacher and a great man, was forced to drink the deadly hemlock. Quintillian, the eminent Roman teacher, was dishonored by all outside of the meagre group who worshipped at his shrine.

At the Council of Tours, in 1163, and at the Council of Paris, in 1209, all discoverers of physical science were condemned by the monks as sinfnl impostors. Roger Bacon, the greatest light of the Middle Ages, simply because he made some experiments in natural philosophy, was accused of magic, and imprisoned by two popes, Nicholas III. and IV. Copernicus was forced to conceal for a long time his discovery of the

Solar System in an anagram in order to save it. Kepler was obliged to do the same thing with his Laws. They could not for many years trust their revealments of the heavenly bodies to the ignorant and bigoted world.

Thus knowledge was stifled, and did not have free course till the sixteenth century. The Mayflower brought the first seeds of true education to our shores and dropped them into republican soil. They took root at once and began to produce abundantly. No longer was education to be confined to the few. Like our air and light, it was to be free. This element of freedom forms a new era in the history of education. What glorious results it has produced! How marvellous have been its achievements! It has set the mass to thinking. It has brought forth comprehensive works, treating of mathematics, history, grammar, philosophy, botany, chemistry, geology, astronomy, agriculture and military science.

What conventions of sages and philosophers it has occasioned! It has given us Washington as the father and Lincoln as the saviour of our land; Franklin as the world's philosopher; Murray and Ballou, whose doctrine satisfies the head and heart; Channing and King, whose philanthropy is boundless; Longfellow and Whittier, whose songs are for the healing of the nations; and Mann, whose life is the richest benediction upon our free institutions.

Now, a system of education which has accomplished all this, ought it not to be loved? Why should not music sing its praises, painting beautify it upon the canvass, sculpture embody it in marble, architecture build shrines for its worship? We should think more of it than the Jew did of his Law, the Athenian of beauty, or the Roman of chivalry, for it is infinitely better. We ought to cherish it, for it produces the best schools, the best literature, the best men and women.

Facts show us, that in our own land, as well as in others, a great work remains yet to be done for the cause of education. Now that the rage and din of war are over, and liberty stands forth cleansed of slavery, we should ascertain what are the facts, and what is the work to be done in this noble cause.

There is still great lack of intelligence in our country. Slavery has left its blight and plague-spot. True education only can abrade its direful effects.

Statistics show that in the Southern States, before the war, of persons over twenty years of age, one out of every twelve was unable to read and write; while in New England, one out of every four hundred; in North Carolina one in three, in Connecticut one in two hundred and ninety-four; in Tennessee one in four, in New Hampshire one in two hundred and sixty; in Virginia one in five, in Masssachusetts one in one hundred; in Alabama one in six, Maine one in eighty.

Comparing Northern States of nearly the same population with Southern States, in every case the former have double the number of schools of the latter.

As great a difference may be shown by contrasting the newspaper and periodical circulation. In New England the circulation of literary papers is in the ratio of 5.30 to each of the white population; in the Southern States, 1.05. The ratio of religious papers in New England is 2.28 to each white person; in the Southern States, .7.

About the same proportion holds good in regard to churches, schools and public libraries. New York has open to public use more than double the number of volumes in all the Southern Atlatic States, and Massachusetts has more books than all the States south of Mason and Dixon's Line.

In view of such facts, it is plain that a great work remains to be done in our country in the way of disseminating knowledge. With warm hearts should the cause of the freedmen be espoused. Money should be liberally given, and teachers earnestly encouraged to go forth to educate and elevate the illiterate whites and blacks throughout our land. The Southern States should be dotted over with free schools and liberal churches. True education will do this, if it is fostered and encouraged. This alone will unite and cement the whole people together, and exalt our nation in righteousness.

In this work real philanthropy is demanded. The labor must be for the good of the whole. A free government and

free institutions are based upon mutual aid. One state must help another. The North must coöperate with the South. If a parent would have his own children educated in truth and virtue, he must lend his influence to have his neighbors' also educated. The sons of Aristides, Pericles and Socrates were ruined by bad associates. The example and influence of their noble fathers could not save them.

To have the home secure, the state must be right; to have the state safe, the states must be right. All should strive for the good of the whole. Our national prosperity depends upon this. Republicanism will not live upon castes. These build not for the ages. They sustained Greece only three hundred years, and Rome but little longer. They drove freedom from the vine-robed hill and the land of the olive. They put it to flight from Venice to the mountains of Switzerland. They drove it from Albion soil across the Atlantic to America, that it might find a genial clime and a fertile land. Here it has growu, and here it should grow. Here it will mature, if nurtured by true education.

If we contrast the work of education in our country with that in other lands, we have reason to be encouraged. The parish schools in Scotland have not diffused, and cannot diffuse knowledge throughout the land, for there is a large population outside of the church or parish. By their present system these are not reached. So among the Highlands, and even in their cities, the poor and the unchurched are sadly neglected. The rich educate their sons and daughters in private schools. In Glasgow and Edinborough there are thousands of children who have no opportunities for obtaining an education. The Scotch believe in classes. For this reason the mass do not feel the worth of universal education. They believe in first-class colleges and high schools, but not in first-class common schools. They have opened wide the doors of learning to the wealthy, and closed them against the indigent. So they have the most striking contrasts of culture and ignorance.

In England, on the part of the nobility, there seems to be a determination to keep the laboring classes degraded. This

they feel can be done most effectively through ignorance. They will not suffer Parliament to provide means for the general diffusion of knowledge. It would really seem that they still believe "a little, or a good deal of knowledge, is a dangerous thing" to a poor man. Their Eton, Harrow, and Rugby Schools, their military academies, their Oxford and Cambridge, are munificently supported. Some of their normal schools are of a high order, but their so-called public schools are not free. Scholars can enter them only by paying so much per week, and the rates are kept above the reach of very many of the working classes; so, from necessity, hosts of their children are growing up in ignorance. It is true, in some of their largest cities they have what are called Ragged and Shoe-Blacking Schools, to which many of the poorest children are gathered portions of each day and instructed in morals and the elements of learning. Yet, after all that is done, there are thousands upon thousands of subjects who have not enjoyed any privileges of education. The poor are mere tools for the rich, and the illiterate are slaves to the cultured. England is a land of striking contrasts and unaccountable odds, of extensive poor-houses and richly-endowed colleges.

France feels, it would seem, that her educational system is almost perfect. It is said that the government has direct and complete control over public institutions. The country is divided up into sixteen districts, with an institution in each called an academy. This recognizes three grades of instruction, denominated superior, secondary, and primary. The first embraces theology, law, medicine and letters; the secondary comprises about the same course of study taught in our colleges; the primary answers to our public schools. The last are scattered throughout the land, numbering five hundred high, thirty thousand intermediate, and thirty-five thousand juvenile schools. The scholars in these schools, for the most part, pay weekly charges to support them. From this fact, a large portion of the poorer children are deprived of any schooling. It is a lamentable truth that but few children here obtain any education. Only one out of six, under sixteen

years of age, is able to read and write; and what is more to be regretted, and singular, too, is that quite a large proportion of those who attend school for a season, acquiring a tolerable knowledge of the elementary branches, lose it all in the course of five years after leaving school, for the reason that the young have scarcely any opportunities for self-improvement. It is true, report says that in the land there are some four hundred public libraries, but these appear as though the books were seldom taken from the shelves. In the cars, or public places, it would be almost an anomaly to see a youth with a book or paper in his hand. If Paris can boast of ninety printing offices and five hundred periodicals, it is a rare thing to see a Frenchman in a Café or omnibus reading a newspaper.

If France has established and fostered some of the best colleges and universities, and produced some of the ablest scholars in medicine, mathematics, and natural history, she has by no means provided for the education of the masses. The public schools fall far behind those of some other countries.

In Prussia, the schools, from the primary to the university, are supported by the government. Every child of the kingdom is obliged under pains and penalties to attend school from the ages of seven to fourteen; so it is seldom that a youth can be found in this country unable to read and write. However, the mass do not advance beyond the primary school; yet, it is true, there are large numbers of the boys who go through the gymnasium and afterwards graduate from the university. Probably no other country sends out from its institutions so many highly educated men, but we cannot say so much of their women. The sexes are not educated together even in their primary schools. The Prussians do not seem to think it necessary, or that the girls should have equal advantages with the boys for an education. They are not willing to allow that woman is gifted by nature to teach, or can instruct even the little children as successfully as men. Accordingly, most of their schools are taught by males.

But this country, with its rigid educational systems, its charity and redemption institutes, its six famous universities,

is not taking the lead, and is scarcely keeping pace in the march of civilization. We cannot account for this, only on the ground that woman is not properly esteemed and educated, and that the young men, on leaving school, have but few opportunities for applying or using their knowledge and acquirements.

In Switzerland, whose form of government is purely republican, and whose laws require the children to attend school the same as in Prussia, the cause of education is greatly impeded by the diversity of language which is necessarily forced upon them. The German is their mother-tongue, but the French and Italians, from their proximity and innovations, have forced their language upon the nation, so that in many of their schools they are obliged to teach the elements of learning in French, German, and Italian. In some of the cantons there is such a mingling and blending of these tongues that they have no pure dialect or language. The Universities of Basil, Berne, and Zurich have done much to give dignity and character to their nation. Pestalozzi, the man who has exerted the best and greatest influence for the cause of education during the last hundred years, was a native of this country. But in spite of first-class educators and schools, this nation is impeded in intellectual progress from the fact that they have no universal language.

Poor priest-ridden Italy is now taking rapid strides in the cause of education. At the present time she spends as much for the support of schools as wealthy France. Before 1859, in her whole kingdom, with a population of 25,000,000, there were less than 7,000 schools, with less than 250,000 children in them, while in 1859 the number had increased to more than 32,000 schools, having an attendance of 1,250,000 children.

The present system of schools in Italy is being modeled after our own. The Italian Parliament requested of our Minister, Hon. G. P. Marsh, that he should draw up a system of common school education to be presented to their body. He complied with their wish, and presented them with our plan, which they adopted. From the figures given, it is evidently

working admirably. The Italian people are now agitating the question of imposing upon all children compulsory measures to attend school, the same as in Switzerland and Germany. Not only is there a strong feeling that the boys should be educated, but the girls also. Even Garibaldi, Italy's greatest hero and patriot, is now at the head of a young ladies' seminary. The present promises well for the future of Italy. The twenty-two universities which were dying under the régime of priesthood, are becoming infused with new life. These institutions, which were the glory of the land in the days of Galileo, Volta, and Galvani, are likely to shine again, giving to the world the noblest results of art, science and philosophy.

Perhaps no other city is, at the present time, taking such rapid strides in the work of education as Athens. This city, to a great extent, may justly be called the outgrowth of American civilization. It is only some thirty years since modern Athens took its rise. Drs. Hill and King, both Americans by birth and education, were among its first settlers. When they went there, they could discover but few traces of the old Athenian culture and refinement except in the ruins of brass and marble. At once they opened schools and began to instruct the children of both sexes. The mental fires which they kindled have kept spreading, till the city of some thirty thousand inhabitants is all aglow with the most enthusiastic love of learning. The schools are free to the children of the wealthiest and poorest citizens. They have a first-class normal school, in which are several hundred young women fitting themselves for teachers; also a university, in which there are sixteen hundren young men, preparing them for the various professions. The works of Homer, Socrates, Xenophon, Plato, and Aristotle are household books with them. These they read in the classic Greek, as we read the writings of Prescott, Irving, and Longfellow. The modern Athenians are ambitious to rival their ancient ancestors in culture and high attainments. They are already having a great influence among the Eastern nations. Most of the teachers and physicians in Constantinople, Asia Minor and Syria, are Athenians,

or those educated in Greece. The Greeks have felt the power of education in their recent war with Turkey. This is what has enabled them to withstand the aggressive attacks of that mighty nation. "Knowledge is power" to the Greeks. They would rather possess the eloquence of Demosthenes, the Laws of Solon, and the æsthetic culture of Phidias, than an army like that of Xerxes or a realm like that of the Turkish Sultan. In Ancient Athens Christ was rejected; in the New He is welcomed and loved. Let the educational system of Athens continue which was so fortunately introduced from our own land, when darkness and ignorance covered her plains, hills and mountains, and the Greece of the future will excel the Greece of the past in beauty and glory.

In the providence of God, our country has seemed to be thus far the one to receive the improvements and advantages from all others. England, France, Germany and the East have lavished upon us their best treasures. We have had the advantage of their fortunes and misfortunes. The most splendid opportunities have been opened up to us to dare and to do. With our vast country and great variety of soil, surface and climates, we ought to improve upon the old, and should be able to give back more and better than we received.

The march of civilization thus far has been westward. It has journeyed from Asia through Syria and Egypt and Greece and Italy and Germany and England, and across the Atlantic to America, where it might enjoy the grandest opportunities and possibilities.

After a settlement of some two hundred and fifty years, America has a population of more than 38,000,000 souls, and more than 50,000 free schools, and over 120 colleges, besides thousands of academies and seminaries of learning. No other country, in the same length of time, has produced such a record. Education seems to be the watchword of our land. Its universal cry is for light.

Our civilization is not founded on castes, but equality. In other countries it has appeared to be migratory, and the genius of liberty has been a bird of passage as well as a bird of para-

dise. But here they seem to have found a home, and are giving us the grand results of past experience and accumulated energy. Their course hitherto has been like the wanderings of the Israelites on their way to Canaan, forward and backward, now near and now away, but at length the Promised Land is reached, and now they are building and beautifying temples consecrated to God by the help of a high, noble and Christian education.

Is not the good day dawning of which every one loves to hear and dream and sing? If we would have it ushered in, it must be done through the power of universal education. Our public schools must be fostered and improved. The laws of our land should require every child in it to be in school a longer period than from seven to fourteen years of age. True growth is from beneath upward. Vegetable life germinates low down in the soil; but when its springs and wheels are once set in motion, they keep pushing and lifting up higher and higher the grasses, shrubs and trees, till the air and sunlight are fanned with countless leaves, or sweet-scented with fragrant blossoms, or burdened with luscious fruit. So, in the true process of education, it is from lower to higher orders. The elements first, the higher principles afterwards. The common school first, the college afterwards. Greece and Rome and France and England reversed this order. They attempted to build up by building down. They established universities, but ignored schools for the mass. In this way they felt they should reach the highest condition of civilization; but they have met with a failure instead of a success. From their experience we have learned better things. We realize, that in order to have the best colleges we must have the best common schools; and the higher their grade and condion, the greater is their service to the church and state. Therefore let the lowest and highest become higher, and they will prove safer bulwarks to our nation than the strongest granite forts and the loftiest castle walls.

In our system of education we have many errors and faults to eradicate. It would be strange if, in our unparalelled

growth, there were not many false shoots and protuberances which would need to be cut off. Possibly our successes have engendered somewhat of vanity and false pride, which show themselves in the excessive love of titles. We must admit we are becoming too lavish of them. Honorary degrees, the Germans and English are wont to say, are *very* cheap in America. In the early and palmy days of the Greeks, they made but little account of these; for then "worth made the man, and want of it the fellow;" and so long as Greece and Rome were simple in their tastes, and honored real merit, they were inwardly great and truly successful.

In their palmy days the Greeks expressed their appreciation of deserved honors by crowning with wreaths of simple olive leaves; but as their genius and character degenerated, the value and number of their wreaths and crowns increased, till at length, for the most trifling feats, mental and physical, they bestowed the costliest badges of honor. So, too, the English nobility, in early times, was composed of men deserving respect; but when civil authority and hereditary descent, instead of real worth, came to bring forth nobles, they were for the most part, ignoble, meriting little, but exceedingly pleased with the greatest honors. We have no right to make the same fatal mistake, and treat honors as things of traffic which can be bought and sold, or done up in parchment and stuck upon a man's character. On the entablatures of American institutions should be written in unmistakable type, and the higher the institution the more legible should be the letters, that "mind is the standard of the man," and that real, honest, genuine manliness and godliness, shall be *the* signals, in our country, of merit.

Has it not been a mistake, in our system of education, that we have not given the same advantages to woman that we have to man? Why not let the sexes have equal chances to run toward the goal of knowledge? Why not let all who will, and can, pluck the richest fruit of wisdom?

In Africa woman is treated as a dog, in Asia as a slave, in Europe as a doll, and in America as almost equal to man. Here it is that she lives the most and enjoys the most, because

she thinks the most. Here, as not elsewhere, she is moulding character in our homes, schools, and churches. So far as she has had opportunities, she has proved herself a most successful teacher and scholar. None can question her ability, since she has written some of the most thoughtful essays and imaginative poems in our literature. The names of Child, Stowe, Osgood, Sawyer, Livermore, and many others, plead for the highest education of woman.

We are ready to admit that it is best for man to have a thorough education, let him follow whatever vocation he will. A liberal education tends to make him more of a man, even if he spends his life delving with the pick and spade. Education renders man not a slave to, but a master of, his calling. Let woman enjoy the privileges and immunities of liberal learning, and would she not adorn more richly the home, the school and the church? Would real knowledge make her any the less affectionate, loving, and devoted to kindred and the welfare of man? We know this never has been the case, but invariably the opposite has been true.

Now, then, it becomes our nation and country to remove as fast as possible all the evils in the way of true education, and let it have free course. As a denomination, we should be earnest in this great work. The course of true education should be clear to every Universalist. He ought to calculate what it has done, and what it may be. He knows if it prospers, the cause of liberal Christianity will advance. Science and the religion of the Master point the same way. The former begins, and the latter consummates real growth.

It is true, our denomination has done considerable for this cause. Many have given liberally of their money and influence to establish and sustain institutions of culture. Are we not being abundantly compensated for what has been done? Are not our colleges and schools giving us a higher denominational character? Should not the past encourage us to do more and give more? Elements may oppose, obstacles may lie in the way, yet if we struggle on, like the coral in the depths of the ocean, by and by we will bring up a rock-bound island, smiling with the fairest and best institutions of church and state.

GENERAL REVIEW.

The Kingdom of Israel.

THE reign of Solomon was the culminating point in the power and splendor of the Jewish nation. Though his vast commercial enterprises brought him immense wealth, yet the almost incredible sums spent in the building and lavish ornament of the temple, the palaces, towns and fortifications of Jerusalem, as well as on the frontier fortresses of his kingdom — the costly luxury and display of his court and extensive harem, and the general waste and extravagance which marked every department of his governmental administration, rendered a heavy tax upon the people absolutely necessary for the maintenance of this order of things.

Though this burthen had been increasing from year to year during his reign, the people bore it without open complaint, pleased with the reputation of their monarch for wisdom and power among the nations, and proud of the splendors which he had gathered about Jerusalem and their native land.

But on the death of Solomon they broke into loud murmurs, and demanded of his son and successor, Rehoboham, that the taxes should be reduced, and the government administered on a more economical plan. The tribes of Benjamin and Judah adhered faithfully to the heir of the great King, but the other ten tribes took measures to have their complaints respected and their just demands answered. Failing in this, they broke into open rebellion, and established the kingdom of Israel by the Jewish historian in the books of the Kings and in the national Chronicles. 2 Chron. x.

These events took place B. C. 975, and from this date we are to remember there were two kingdoms; that of Judah, governed by the posterity of David and Solomon, of which Jerusalem was the metropolis, and that of Israel, embracing the ten revolted tribes, whose first king was Jeroboam, and their capital Sheehem. Fifty years afterwards, however, Omri built Samaria, which was the capital city till the fall of the kingdom. This fact is to be constantly remembered

in reading the Scriptures, in order not to confound what is said of one people with what is said of the other.

The kingdom of Israel very soon fell away from the faith of the fathers and the worship of Jehovah, and wandered into idolatry. This decline began with Jeroboam, who for political reasons set up for his people a new worship and national festivals of their own. 1 Kings xii. 26–33.

The idolatrous practices of Solomon during the latter part of his reign had already initiated the people into these things, had broken down their reverence for Jehovah, and familiarized them with the rites of heathen worship. So the action of their new monarch did not shock their religious sense, and the change, under all the circumstances, religious and political, was easily made, and met with comparatively no opposition from the multitude.

Ahab, the son of Omri, who built Samaria, carried this idolatry to still greater excess. He married Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, the King of Tyre. She was a zealous worshipper of Baal, the chief god of her country,[1] and having great influence over her husband, she persuaded him to build a temple and consecrate a grove to Baal, the god of the Phœnicians, to set up his image and appoint priests to conduct his service. Of course, under the protection and patronage of the queen, this particular species of idolatry flourished, and spread rapidly throughout the kingdom. To what extent may be judged from the fact that on one occasion, the contest with Elijah, 450 of the priests of Baal were assembled together.

The narrative of this contest, 1 Kings xvii., shows the character of Baal worship, and the state of things in this early age. Elijah summoned the people to decide between Jehovah and Baal, and between him as a true prophet and the followers of Baal: "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him." He then proposed a sacrifice as a test, and said to the false prophets, "Call ye on the name of your gods, and I will call on the name of the Lord; and the God that answereth by fire, let him be God. And all the people answered, and said, it is well spoken."

"And they took the bullock which was given them, and they dressed it, and called on the name of Baal from morning even until

[1] It was a niece of Jezebel, a grand-daughter of Ethbaal, the Dido of Virgil and classic history, who built Carthage, that great commercial city which, when Hannibal commanded her armies, came near wresting the empire of the world from Rome.

noon, saying, O Baal, hear us. But there was no voice, nor any that answered. And they leaped upon the altar which was made. And it came to pass at noon, that Elijah mocked them, and said, Cry aloud, for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked. And they cried aloud, and cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets, till the blood gushed out upon them. And it came to pass, when mid-day was past, and they prophesid until the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, that there was neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded."

Then Elijah made ready his sacrifice, and stood forth alone, clothed in his mantle and rough dress of camel's hair and leather, his head bared, and his white locks and long grey beard streaming on the wind, majestic, calm and stern, amid the crowd of baffled and revengeful priests, with the eager and expectant multitude of idolatrous Israelites looking on — there he stood, a type of the old Scottish Covenanters, and of our own Puritan Fathers, self-reliant, the embodiment of reverent piety, unconquerable in his faith, terrible in his earnestness; and lifting up his hands to heaven he prayed:

"Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel, and that I am thy servant, and that I have done all these things at thy word. Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people may know that thou art the Lord God, and that thou hast turned their heart back again. Then the fire of the Lord fell, and consumed the burnt sacrifice, and the wood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench. And when all the people saw it they fell on their faces; and they said, The Lord, he is the God, the Lord, he is the God!"

Notwithstanding all this, Jezebel persisted in her idolatry; and on hearing what Elijah had done in the destruction of the false prophets, sought his life. And the house of Ahab, and the people of Israel, gradually, under her energetic influence, fell into their old ways again, and went from bad to worse, till the prophets of Baal, urging him to war with Ben-hadad, King of Syria, and promising him success in the name of their god, he was overthrown and killed.

This transaction, 1 Kings xxii. requires a passing notice, because the record of it has been so much mistaken and misinterpreted.

Jehosaphat, King of Judah, was on a visit to Ahab, in reference to state matters, probably, when the latter proposed a joint war against the King of Syria, to which Jehosaphat agreed, but desired that the word of the Lord should be consulted in regard to it. Instead of this,

Ahab gathered 400 of his false prophets, and consulted them as to the prospects of success. Of course, knowing their master's wishes, they all, as one man, gave assurance of victory. But the King of Judah was not satisfied with this, and asked, "Is there not here a prophet of the Lord Jehovah, that we might inquire of him?"

"And the King of Israel said unto Jehosaphat, There is yet one man, Micaiah, the son of Imlah, by whom we may inquire of the Lord; but I hate him, for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil. And Jehosaphat said, Let not the king say so.

"So he came to the king. And the king said unto him, Micaiah; shall we go against Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall we forbear? And he answered him, Go, and prosper; for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king. And the king said unto him, How many times shall I adjure thee that thou tell me nothing but that which is true in the name of the Lord? And he said, I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd; and the Lord said, These have no master; let them return every man to his house in peace. And the King of Israel said unto Jehosaphat, Did I not tell thee he would prophesy no good concerning me, but evil? And he said, Hear thou, therefore, the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also; go forth and do so. Now, therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee.

"And the king of Israel said, Take Micaiah, and carry him back unto Amon, the governor of the city, and to Joash, the king's son, and say, Thus saith the king, Put this fellow in the prison, and feed him with bread of affliction, and with water of affliction, until I come in peace. And Micaiah said, If thou return at all in peace, the Lord hath not spoken by me."

This account is plainly a parable, or an allegorical representation, and no more to be taken literally than the account of the dialogues between the Lord and Satan in the first chapters of Job, or the parables of the Saviour, or those of the other prophets. An example of the same kind may be seen in the parable of the trees going forth to choose a king, as told by Jotham when the men of Shechem made Abimelech king.—Judges ix. 6–15. The language of Micaiah—

or those educated in Greece. The Greeks have felt the power of education in their recent war with Turkey. This is what has enabled them to withstand the aggressive attacks of that mighty nation. "Knowledge is power" to the Greeks. They would rather possess the eloquence of Demosthenes, the Laws of Solon, and the æsthetic culture of Phidias, than an army like that of Xerxes or a realm like that of the Turkish Sultan. In Ancient Athens Christ was rejected; in the New He is welcomed and loved. Let the educational system of Athens continue which was so fortunately introduced from our own land, when darkness and ignorance covered her plains, hills and mountains, and the Greece of the future will excel the Greece of the past in beauty and glory.

In the providence of God, our country has seemed to be thus far the one to receive the improvements and advantages from all others. England, France, Germany and the East have lavished upon us their best treasures. We have had the advantage of their fortunes and misfortunes. The most splendid opportunities have been opened up to us to dare and to do. With our vast country and great variety of soil, surface and climates, we ought to improve upon the old, and should be able to give back more and better than we received.

The march of civilization thus far has been westward. It has journeyed from Asia through Syria and Egypt and Greece aud Italy and Germany and England, and across the Atlantic to America, where it might enjoy the grandest opportunities and possibilities.

After a settlement of some two hundred and fifty years, America has a population of more than 38,000,000 souls, and more than 50,000 free schools, and over 120 colleges, besides thousands of academies and seminaries of learning. No other country, in the same length of time, has produced such a record. Education seems to be the watchword of our land. Its universal cry is for light.

Our civilization is not founded on castes, but equality. In other countries it has appeared to be migratory, and the genius of liberty has been a bird of passage as well as a bird of para-

dise. But here they seem to have found a home, and are giving us the grand results of past experience and accumulated energy. Their course hitherto has been like the wanderings of the Israelites on their way to Canaan, forward and backward, now near and now away, but at length the Promised Land is reached, and now they are building and beautifying temples consecrated to God by the help of a high, noble and Christian education.

Is not the good day dawning of which every one loves to hear and dream and sing? If we would have it ushered in, it must be done through the power of universal education. Our public schools must be fostered and improved. The laws of our land should require every child in it to be in school a longer period than from seven to fourteen years of age. True growth is from beneath upward. Vegetable life germinates low down in the soil; but when its springs and wheels are once set in motion, they keep pushing and lifting up higher and higher the grasses, shrubs and trees, till the air and sunlight are fanned with countless leaves, or sweet-scented with fragrant blossoms, or burdened with luscious fruit. So, in the true process of education, it is from lower to higher orders. The elements first, the higher principles afterwards. The common school first, the college afterwards. Greece and Rome and France and England reversed this order. They attempted to build up by building down. They established universities, but ignored schools for the mass. In this way they felt they should reach the highest condition of civilization; but they have met with a failure instead of a success. From their experience we have learned better things. We realize, that in order to have the best colleges we must have the best common schools; and the higher their grade and condion, the greater is their service to the church and state. Therefore let the lowest and highest become higher, and they will prove safer bulwarks to our nation than the strongest granite forts and the loftiest castle walls.

In our system of education we have many errors and faults to eradicate. It would be strange if, in our unparalelled

GENERAL REVIEW.

The Kingdom of Israel.

THE reign of Solomon was the culminating point in the power and splendor of the Jewish nation. Though his vast commercial enterprises brought him immense wealth, yet the almost incredible sums spent in the building and lavish ornament of the temple, the palaces, towns and fortifications of Jerusalem, as well as on the frontier fortresses of his kingdom — the costly luxury and display of his court and extensive harem, and the general waste and extravagance which marked every department of his governmental administration, rendered a heavy tax upon the people absolutely necessary for the maintenance of this order of things.

Though this burthen had been increasing from year to year during his reign, the people bore it without open complaint, pleased with the reputation of their monarch for wisdom and power among the nations, and proud of the splendors which he had gathered about Jerusalem and their native land.

But on the death of Solomon they broke into loud murmurs, and demanded of his son and successor, Rehoboham, that the taxes should be reduced, and the government administered on a more economical plan. The tribes of Benjamin and Judah adhered faithfully to the heir of the great King, but the other ten tribes took measures to have their complaints respected and their just demands answered. Failing in this, they broke into open rebellion, and established the kingdom of Israel by the Jewish historian in the books of the Kings and in the national Chronicles. 2 Chron. x.

These events took place B. C. 975, and from this date we are to remember there were two kingdoms; that of Judah, governed by the posterity of David and Solomon, of which Jerusalem was the metropolis, and that of Israel, embracing the ten revolted tribes, whose first king was Jeroboam, and their capital Sheehem. Fifty years afterwards, however, Omri built Samaria, which was the capital city till the fall of the kingdom. This fact is to be constantly remembered

in reading the Scriptures, in order not to confound what is said of one people with what is said of the other.

The kingdom of Israel very soon fell away from the faith of the fathers and the worship of Jehovah, and wandered into idolatry. This decline began with Jeroboam, who for political reasons set up for his people a new worship and national festivals of their own. 1 Kings xii. 26–33.

The idolatrous practices of Solomon during the latter part of his reign had already initiated the people into these things, had broken down their reverence for Jehovah, and familiarized them with the rites of heathen worship. So the action of their new monarch did not shock their religious sense, and the change, under all the circumstances, religious and political, was easily made, and met with comparatively no opposition from the multitude.

Ahab, the son of Omri, who built Samaria, carried this idolatry to still greater excess. He married Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, the King of Tyre. She was a zealous worshipper of Baal, the chief god of her country,[1] and having great influence over her husband, she persuaded him to build a temple and consecrate a grove to Baal, the god of the Phœnicians, to set up his image and appoint priests to conduct his service. Of course, under the protection and patronage of the queen, this particular species of idolatry flourished, and spread rapidly throughout the kingdom. To what extent may be judged from the fact that on one occasion, the contest with Elijah, 450 of the priests of Baal were assembled together.

The narrative of this contest, 1 Kings xvii., shows the character of Baal worship, and the state of things in this early age. Elijah summoned the people to decide between Jehovah and Baal, and between him as a true prophet and the followers of Baal: "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him." He then proposed a sacrifice as a test, and said to the false prophets, "Call ye on the name of your gods, and I will call on the name of the Lord; and the God that answereth by fire, let him be God. And all the people answered, and said, it is well spoken."

"And they took the bullock which was given them, and they dressed it, and called on the name of Baal from morning even until

[1] It was a niece of Jezebel, a grand-daughter of Ethbaal, the Dido of Virgil and classic history, who built Carthage, that great commercial city which, when Hannibal commanded her armies, came near wresting the empire of the world from Rome.

growth, there were not many false shoots and protuberances which would need to be cut off. Possibly our successes have engendered somewhat of vanity and false pride, which show themselves in the excessive love of titles. We must admit we are becoming too lavish of them. Honorary degrees, the Germans and English are wont to say, are *very* cheap in America. In the early and palmy days of the Greeks, they made but little account of these; for then "worth made the man, and want of it the fellow;" and so long as Greece and Rome were simple in their tastes, and honored real merit, they were inwardly great and truly successful.

In their palmy days the Greeks expressed their appreciation of deserved honors by crowning with wreaths of simple olive leaves; but as their genius and character degenerated, the value and number of their wreaths and crowns increased, till at length, for the most trifling feats, mental and physical, they bestowed the costliest badges of honor. So, too, the English nobility, in early times, was composed of men deserving respect; but when civil authority and hereditary descent, instead of real worth, came to bring forth nobles, they were for the most part, ignoble, meriting little, but exceedingly pleased with the greatest honors. We have no right to make the same fatal mistake, and treat honors as things of traffic which can be bought and sold, or done up in parchment and stuck upon a man's character. On the entablatures of American institutions should be written in unmistakable type, and the higher the institution the more legible should be the letters, that "mind is the standard of the man," and that real, honest, genuine manliness and godliness, shall be *the* signals, in our country, of merit.

Has it not been a mistake, in our system of education, that we have not given the same advantages to woman that we have to man? Why not let the sexes have equal chances to run toward the goal of knowledge? Why not let all who will, and can, pluck the richest fruit of wisdom?

In Africa woman is treated as a dog, in Asia as a slave, in Europe as a doll, and in America as almost equal to man. Here it is that she lives the most and enjoys the most, because

she thinks the most. Here, as not elsewhere, she is moulding character in our homes, schools, and churches. So far as she has had opportunities, she has proved herself a most successful teacher and scholar. None can question her ability, since she has written some of the most thoughtful essays and imaginative poems in our literature. The names of Child, Stowe, Osgood, Sawyer, Livermore, and many others, plead for the highest education of woman.

We are ready to admit that it is best for man to have a thorough education, let him follow whatever vocation he will. A liberal education tends to make him more of a man, even if he spends his life delving with the pick and spade. Education renders man not a slave to, but a master of, his calling. Let woman enjoy the privileges and immunities of liberal learning, and would she not adorn more richly the home, the school and the church? Would real knowledge make her any the less affectionate, loving, and devoted to kindred and the welfare of man? We know this never has been the case, but invariably the opposite has been true.

Now, then, it becomes our nation and country to remove as fast as possible all the evils in the way of true education, and let it have free course. As a denomination, we should be earnest in this great work. The course of true education should be clear to every Universalist. He ought to calculate what it has done, and what it may be. He knows if it prospers, the cause of liberal Christianity will advance. Science and the religion of the Master point the same way. The former begins, and the latter consummates real growth.

It is true, our denomination has done considerable for this cause. Many have given liberally of their money and influence to establish and sustain institutions of culture. Are we not being abundantly compensated for what has been done? Are not our colleges and schools giving us a higher denominational character? Should not the past encourage us to do more and give more? Elements may oppose, obstacles may lie in the way, yet if we struggle on, like the coral in the depths of the ocean, by and by we will bring up a rock-bound island, smiling with the fairest and best institutions of church and state.

GENERAL REVIEW.

The Kingdom of Israel.

THE reign of Solomon was the culminating point in the power and splendor of the Jewish nation. Though his vast commercial enterprises brought him immense wealth, yet the almost incredible sums spent in the building and lavish ornament of the temple, the palaces, towns and fortifications of Jerusalem, as well as on the frontier fortresses of his kingdom — the costly luxury and display of his court and extensive harem, and the general waste and extravagance which marked every department of his governmental administration, rendered a heavy tax upon the people absolutely necessary for the maintenance of this order of things.

Though this burthen had been increasing from year to year during his reign, the people bore it without open complaint, pleased with the reputation of their monarch for wisdom and power among the nations, and proud of the splendors which he had gathered about Jerusalem and their native land.

But on the death of Solomon they broke into loud murmurs, and demanded of his son and successor, Rehoboham, that the taxes should be reduced, and the government administered on a more economical plan. The tribes of Benjamin and Judah adhered faithfully to the heir of the great King, but the other ten tribes took measures to have their complaints respected and their just demands answered. Failing in this, they broke into open rebellion, and established the kingdom of Israel by the Jewish historian in the books of the Kings and in the national Chronicles. 2 Chron. x.

These events took place B. C. 975, and from this date we are to remember there were two kingdoms; that of Judah, governed by the posterity of David and Solomon, of which Jerusalem was the metropolis, and that of Israel, embracing the ten revolted tribes, whose first king was Jeroboam, and their capital Sheehem. Fifty years afterwards, however, Omri built Samaria, which was the capital city till the fall of the kingdom. This fact is to be constantly remembered

in reading the Scriptures, in order not to confound what is said of one people with what is said of the other.

The kingdom of Israel very soon fell away from the faith of the fathers and the worship of Jehovah, and wandered into idolatry. This decline began with Jeroboam, who for political reasons set up for his people a new worship and national festivals of their own. 1 Kings xii. 26–33.

The idolatrous practices of Solomon during the latter part of his reign had already initiated the people into these things, had broken down their reverence for Jehovah, and familiarized them with the rites of heathen worship. So the action of their new monarch did not shock their religious sense, and the change, under all the circumstances, religious and political, was easily made, and met with comparatively no opposition from the multitude.

Ahab, the son of Omri, who built Samaria, carried this idolatry to still greater excess. He married Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, the King of Tyre. She was a zealous worshipper of Baal, the chief god of her country,[1] and having great influence over her husband, she persuaded him to build a temple and consecrate a grove to Baal, the god of the Phœnicians, to set up his image and appoint priests to conduct his service. Of course, under the protection and patronage of the queen, this particular species of idolatry flourished, and spread rapidly throughout the kingdom. To what extent may be judged from the fact that on one occasion, the contest with Elijah, 450 of the priests of Baal were assembled together.

The narrative of this contest, 1 Kings xvii., shows the character of Baal worship, and the state of things in this early age. Elijah summoned the people to decide between Jehovah and Baal, and between him as a true prophet and the followers of Baal: "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him." He then proposed a sacrifice as a test, and said to the false prophets, "Call ye on the name of your gods, and I will call on the name of the Lord; and the God that answereth by fire, let him be God. And all the people answered, and said, it is well spoken."

"And they took the bullock which was given them, and they dressed it, and called on the name of Baal from morning even until

[1] It was a niece of Jezebel, a grand-daughter of Ethbaal, the Dido of Virgil and classic history, who built Carthage, that great commercial city which, when Hannibal commanded her armies, came near wresting the empire of the world from Rome.

noon, saying, O Baal, hear us. But there was no voice, nor any that answered. And they leaped upon the altar which was made. And it came to pass at noon, that Elijah mocked them, and said, Cry aloud, for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked. And they cried aloud, and cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets, till the blood gushed out upon them. And it came to pass, when mid-day was past, and they prophesid until the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, that there was neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded."

Then Elijah made ready his sacrifice, and stood forth alone, clothed in his mantle and rough dress of camel's hair and leather, his head bared, and his white locks and long grey beard streaming on the wind, majestic, calm and stern, amid the crowd of baffled and revengeful priests, with the eager and expectant multitude of idolatrous Israelites looking on — there he stood, a type of the old Scottish Covenanters, and of our own Puritan Fathers, self-reliant, the embodiment of reverent piety, unconquerable in his faith, terrible in his earnestness; and lifting up his hands to heaven he prayed:

"Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel, and that I am thy servant, and that I have done all these things at thy word. Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people may know that thou art the Lord God, and that thou hast turned their heart back again. Then the fire of the Lord fell, and consumed the burnt sacrifice, and the wood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench. And when all the people saw it they fell on their faces; and they said, The Lord, he is the God, the Lord, he is the God!"

Notwithstanding all this, Jezebel persisted in her idolatry; and on hearing what Elijah had done in the destruction of the false prophets, sought his life. And the house of Ahab, and the people of Israel, gradually, under her energetic influence, fell into their old ways again, and went from bad to worse, till the prophets of Baal, urging him to war with Ben-hadad, King of Syria, and promising him success in the name of their god, he was overthrown and killed.

This transaction, 1 Kings xxii. requires a passing notice, because the record of it has been so much mistaken and misinterpreted.

Jehosaphat, King of Judah, was on a visit to Ahab, in reference to state matters, probably, when the latter proposed a joint war against the King of Syria, to which Jehosaphat agreed, but desired that the word of the Lord should be consulted in regard to it. Instead of this,

Ahab gathered 400 of his false prophets, and consulted them as to the prospects of success. Of course, knowing their master's wishes, they all, as one man, gave assurance of victory. But the King of Judah was not satisfied with this, and asked, "Is there not here a prophet of the Lord Jehovah, that we might inquire of him?"

"And the King of Israel said unto Jehosaphat, There is yet one man, Micaiah, the son of Imlah, by whom we may inquire of the Lord; but I hate him, for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil. And Jehosaphat said, Let not the king say so.

"So he came to the king. And the king said unto him, Micaiah; shall we go against Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall we forbear? And he answered him, Go, and prosper; for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king. And the king said unto him, How many times shall I adjure thee that thou tell me nothing but that which is true in the name of the Lord? And he said, I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd; and the Lord said, These have no master; let them return every man to his house in peace. And the King of Israel said unto Jehosaphat, Did I not tell thee he would prophesy no good concerning me, but evil? And he said, Hear thou, therefore, the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also; go forth and do so. Now, therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee.

"And the king of Israel said, Take Micaiah, and carry him back unto Amon, the governor of the city, and to Joash, the king's son, and say, Thus saith the king, Put this fellow in the prison, and feed him with bread of affliction, and with water of affliction, until I come in peace. And Micaiah said, If thou return at all in peace, the Lord hath not spoken by me."

This account is plainly a parable, or an allegorical representation, and no more to be taken literally than the account of the dialogues between the Lord and Satan in the first chapters of Job, or the parables of the Saviour, or those of the other prophets. An example of the same kind may be seen in the parable of the trees going forth to choose a king, as told by Jotham when the men of Shechem made Abimelech king.—Judges ix. 6–15. The language of Micaiah—

"*Go and prosper!*" is plainly irony, spoken in derision of Ahab's ambitious design. And the king as plainly so understood it; hence he says, substantially, "No more of this satire — how many times I have adjured thee to speak truly?" And then when he set forth the truth in his parable, the king at once understood it, and said to Jehosaphat, "Did I not tell thee he would prophesy evil concerning me?"

The result proved the truth of the prophetic parables of Micaiah. Ahab was slain, and his troops defeated and scattered like frightened sheep upon the hills, thus showing that a lying spirit was on the tongue of Baal's prophets when they told the king he should go up to battle and prosper.

There was no improvement after the death of Ahab, his successor following his steps till Jehu usurped the throne, destroying all the house of Ahab and all the prophets of Baal. But this reformation was transient. The people had thoroughly given themselves to idolatry, and to all manner of iniquity. From year to year things grew worse, morally, religiously and politically, and their overthrow and captivity, drew near, as predicted by Isaiah, chapter vii.

The first appearance of the Assyrians in Israel was B. C. 772, in the reign of Menahem, when, according to the 2d Book of the Kings, xv. and xvi., and the royal Chronicles, Pul, or Phul, made war on Israel, and was bought off by a bribe of a thousand silver talents, or nearly two million dollars of our currency.

About thirty years after, the King of Judah, threatened by the combined kings of Israel and Syria, sought the assistance of Tiglath-Pileser, King of Assyria. The same records state that he sent messengers to the Assyrian monarch, saying, "I am thy servant and thy son; come up and save me out of the hand of the kings of Syria and Israel, which rise up against me. And Ahaz took the silver and gold which was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasury of the king's house, and sent it for a present to the King of Assyria." 2 Kings xvi.

Tiglath-Pileser accepted the gift, and marched on Syria, overran Galilee and the country east of Jordan, carried the chief inhabitants captive into Assyria, and compelled an annual tribute from the Israelitish kings.

Some thirty-five years after this, Hoshea, who was then on the throne of Israel, attempted to throw off the yoke of the Assyrian; and making a secret treaty with the King of Egypt, he refused to pay the annual tribute, and openly rebelled against his master. This brought things to a crisis.

Shalmaneser, who occupied the Assyrian throne, promptly marched into the country, laid siege to Samaria, the capital, and though it was bravely defended for three years, finally took it, imprisoned the king, and carried the ten tribes, the mass of the population, into captivity beyond the Euphrates. Thus ended the Kingdom of Israel, 254 years from its establishment by the great revolt at the death of Solomon, thirty years after the foundation of Rome, and about 720 years before the birth of our Saviour.

The Doctrine of Endless Punishment in England.

THE question of endless punishment seems to be discussed in England with as much interest, and freedom, and vigor as ever, and among the Orthodox sects it is demanding and receiving even more attention than usual. A late English paper gives us two examples illustrating this point, and showing at the same time the liberty of the secular press in reporting the results of the discussions and investigations respecting this all important subject. Evidently, English editors are sufficiently informed of the public sentiment regarding this doctrine to feel assured that they do not put in peril the length of their subscription list by printing arguments and opinions hostile to it.

Lately a dissenting minister stated as a reason for believing the doctrine that "the same word applied to the punishment of the wicked is applied to the blessing of the righteous; and if we limit the word in the one case, we must in the other." The *Cheltenham Telegraph* takes this for a leader and makes the following point:

"Is Dr. Brown seriously prepared to base on this simple repetition of the word 'everlasting' the awful dogma of the *endlessness* of punishment; or is he prepared to affirm that such is the *essential* and *invariable* meaning of that word itself, *i.e.*, that it can never admit of limitation in any sense? For the information of our readers we beg to state that the original Greek word — *ἀιώνιος* — is equivalent to the Latin *æternus* or *ævi-ternus*, which literally means *age-lasting*, and it is generally agreed among scholars that its meaning is defined by the substantive of which it may happen to be an adjunct. Regardless, however, of this fact, Dr. Brown adds: 'But this is not all; the same word is applied to God. He is spoken of as an *Eternal* God,' and then he puts the query: 'Who would venture to limit the word eternal when applied to God?' We presume no one, inasmuch as the transcendent being of God is incompatible with the idea of limitation; but not so is 'punishment' (*κόλασις*) which is essentially *remedial* in

its nature, and therefore terminable, while the 'Life' described as *everlasting* is essentially progressive in its nature, and, therefore, indefinitely boundless in its development. As an obvious and undeniable instance of definite limitation of meaning, let us refer our readers to Hab. iii, 6: 'And the everlasting mountains were scattered,' on which we need not enlarge."

Then, after reading him a merited rebuke for his intolerance in judging the motives of those rejecting the doctrine, the editor says, "We believe that *many* of the most thoughtful hearers, on quitting the sacred edifice, shared with ourselves in the reflection: If such uncharitableness of spirit is the natural and inevitable result of a firm belief in the doctrine of 'everlasting punishment,' the sooner it is erased from the number of the professed dogmas of every sect of Christendom the better it will be for the world of humanity!" And he fears that "unconditional belief in eternal (i. e., endless) torment as a necessary preliminary" to Christian discipleship, would exclude from the Church "some of the most eminent and saintly of living divines."

Another example is furnished by the *Devon Weekly Times*, in which is noticed an able lecture on "Eternal Punishment," delivered in that place the Sunday previous. The preacher, Rev. T. W. Chignell, is reported as follows:

"Our acceptability with the Maker, he said, did not depend on creeds or forms of worship. Dante believed in the Trinity and worshipped the Virgin Mary, and yet he was one of the divinest of men. John Milton, John Locke, and Isaac Newton did not believe in the Trinity, and never did or ever would worship the Virgin Mary, and they were among the divinest of men. Creeds and forms of worship were but the costume in which religion appeared, and that costume varied with the ages.

"As to the doctrine of eternal perdition, he contended that there was no logical, scientific statement of that ecclesiastical theory to be found anywhere in the Bible. In the Old Testament the word 'hell' meant the grave, or the Greek 'Hades.' In the New Testament there were two words used by Christ which our translators had rendered by the word 'hell,' viz., Hades and Gehenna. The word Hades the Jews borrowed from the Greeks. Gehenna was a place of horror to the Jews. It was outside Jesrusalem, where all the offal of the city was desposited, and where fires were kept constantly burning to consume the corruption which festered there. Christ, in alluding to the fires of Gehenna, did so to startle men out of their vices—the consuming flames there were typical of that moral retribution which followed from indulgence in vice, and not as meaning everlasting pun-

ishment of the unrighteous in the future. Still less did Christ mean that men would be subjected to such a fearful doom for errors in theological opinion."

We make this record, and give these extracts, not because they contain anything new in the way of criticism or argument, but because they show the freedom with which the subject is discussed editorially by the secular press of England; and because this freedom reveals to some extent the mind and feeling of the people respecting the question of endless punishment. The character of the public press is a reasonably fair test of the public sentiment and desire; and when, therefore, the daily journals send out leading articles such as are given above, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the readers of these journals do in a good degree sympathize with the spirit and teaching of them.

The German Catholic Reformation.

THE contest between "the Old Catholics," as they call themselves, or the "anti-Infalliblists" and the Papal Party, waxes fiercer from day to day. But in the midst of the conflict one fact is becoming clear — that Dr. Döllinger and his followers have no thought of a Protestant movement or a German Catholic Church. They intend to remain within *the* Church, and what work they have to do will be done as Catholics, and not as Protestants. Indeed, they claim to be the only true and primitive Catholics, and hence the name "Old Catholics." It is the Papal party who are "New Catholics," or, in other words, who have departed from the faith and practice of the early Church. They propose to purge and purify the Church from the errors and corruptions which have grown up within it through the wickedness of popes and priests, cardinals and jesuits. This point has been very distinctly and positively announced by their great leader. In a recent interview with an American he is reported as saying,

"It is not the intention of those who are engaged in this movement to bring about a separation. Their intention is simply to remain where they are; to claim all their rights as members of the Church in which they were born and educated. The real state of things is this: The bishops try all they can to drive the opponents of the Vatican decrees to a separation by ecclesiastical censures, by excommunications or suspensions. Of course it would be more advantageous to the cause of ultramontanism if the whole movement could be reduced to

the narrow limits of a mere sect or denomination. That is their simple calculation. Their opponents — priests and laymen — are determined to remain where they are, and only do what is allowed according to Church principles; but in cases of necessity — as, for instance, the administration of sacraments as well as in the celebration of funerals — as in the case of Professor Zeuger, it is a necessity for them to help themselves by performing the offices which are refused by the parish priests; but in no way is there a tendency to separation."[1]

"We desire a national German Catholic Church so far as the German national character demands it. We wish the exclusion of Italian superstitions; we wish to preserve German interests, for example, in the language, in the use of the language in the Liturgy, in the rights of the Germans to reject what does not please them, but may please the Roman people. We wish to do away with the worship of saints, of the worship of Maria, which is carried to such an extent by the Italian and Spaniard, but which is now only artificially cultivated among us, and has not a deep root in the people."

A correspondent of the English *Guardian*, who had opportunities of conversing freely with Dr. Döllinger, says that there is nothing revolutionary in the views of the "Old Catholics." They have the sagacity to see that outside the Church of Rome they would be simply a Protestant sect, and powerless; whereas, remaining where they are, they are able to work effectually for a Reformation of the Church itself. In this direction, says the great theologian, "a movement is set on foot of which I shall not live to see the triumph; but its triumph is certain, sooner or later. The Papal system must eventually succumb before it." To advance this success, he looks to the loss of the temporal power of the Pope and the occupation of Rome by the Italian Government; to the support which the authorities in Hungary are giving to the remonstrant bishops; to the education of the German peasantry by masters appointed by the Government; and, above all, to the general enlightenment of Europe, which will refuse to accept the last dogma promulgated at Rome.

[1] Prof. Zeuger, mentioned above, was greatly esteemed for his learning, and having refused submission to the dogma of Infallibility on his death-bed, the clergy refused to administer the sacrament to him and give him extreme unction. Whereupon, Professor Friedrich, his excommunicated colleague, obtained the consecrated oil from an orthodox curate and administered it to his dying friend. Two days later the distinguished heretic was followed to his grave by upwards of 20,000 people, among whom were a large proportion of the chief people of Munich. Döllinger performed the funeral rites, and the same evening the students made a solemn torch-light procession to his grave.

And the governments, especially of Bavaria and Prussia, seem disposed to aid the movement all in their power, and are determined, notwithstanding the threats made, to establish the fact that the State is supreme, and the Church subordinate. We say "threats," because the tone of the Roman Catholic press of Germany points unmistakably to a conflict in this direction. There is not one of its organs but uses the most inflammatory language towards the dissenters, and especially against the cabinet of Berlin. The *Germania*, which is published in that capital, says, in one of its last numbers:

"Let our position not be misunderstood. We will not tamely submit and let our holy cause be impudently trampled upon. It is true, we do not possess any skill as revolutionists; but under certain circumstances people are apt to learn very rapidly."

On the other hand, the King of *Bavaria* has openly taken ground against the Papal Infalliblists, and has dismissed his prime minister, who was in sympathy with them, and put in his place a prominent Protestant, who has always been cordially hated by the ultramontanes. And in addition to this, he cordially sustains the University of Munich in electing Dr. Döllinger as its Rector, which it did by a vote of fifty-four against a dissenting vote of only six. In the meantime, according to the *Evening Post*,

"The *Prussian* Minister of Religious Affairs and Public Instruction, in accordance with instructions from Prince Bismarck and Emperor William, allows hardly a day to pass by without striking a fresh blow at the Papal or Roman party. Lately he authorized the excommunicated priest, Kaminski, who had formed a large "Old Catholic" congregation, to hold divine service in the Catholic Nothkirche, and the protest of the bishop of the diocese against this measure elicited the answer that the same policy would be followed in similar cases.[2] The "Old Catholics," for whom ultramontane priests refused to perform the marriage service, have been assured on the part of the Government that at the next session of the German Parliament the Imperial Chancellor would submit a bill rendering the institution of civil marriage *obligatory* throughout the empire. Another bill of equal importance, taking the supervision of the schools from the hands of the clergy and placing it in those of eminent educators, is also said to be preparing. And, finally, it is asserted by well-informed German journals that the Imperial Government will refuse to recognize

[2] And this threat has been carried out since in the case of a priest at Breslau who had been excommunicated by the Prince Bishop of that town, and who has been sustained by the Government, and now celebrates mass in his church in defiance of his ecclesiastical superior.

the successor of Pius the Ninth, in case the ultramontane cardinals, after the death of the present Pope, by hurriedly convoking a conclave, should elect a prelate imbued with their aggressive and intolerant principles."

In *Wurtemberg* the ministers were questioned in open chamber as to the steps they intended to take to counteract the encroachments of the Vatican bishops. The answer was that the "Old Catholics" would be protected by the Government.

So the conflict extends, and the interest deepens. The "Old Catholic" congress held in Munich, Sept. 23–25, promised to be the largest convention of Catholics held in Germany for many years. On this occasion the interests of the new movement were discussed by the ablest men of the various nations represented, and we wait with anxiety for a report of its proceedings.

"*The Ten Great Religions.*"[1]

Dr. Clarke modestly calls his work an Essay. It is really a rich and able contribution to one of the most important inquiries of the age. The field of investigation is comparatively new, and has scarcely been explored at all with reference to the object had in view by the author. He aims to show us what is true and what is false, what is permanent and what transient, in the great religions reviewed; and to set forth the fact that they are all narrow, local, ethnical, the religions of countries and races, and incapable of being expanded, any one of them, into a universal religion, a religion for all nations and all times. On the other hand, he shows that Christianity differs from them all precisely on this point, inasmuch as it is pre-eminently a catholic, universal religion, complete in its revelations of duty and destiny, comprehensive in all its principles and teachings, satisfying all the reasonable wants of man, and capable of an expansion and development corresponding to any measure of progress, any degree of civilization and intellectual growth, of which the human race is capable.

Unquestionably the author has done good service in bringing together, and giving some orderly shape to, the facts which scholarly research has brought to light in the last half century respecting the doctrines, aims and spirit of Brahmanism Buddhism, Confucianism,

[1] The Ten Great Religions: an Essay in Comparative Theology. By James Freeman Clark. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. $3.00.

the religions of Egypt, Persia, Greece, Rome, and the influences which they have exerted upon the virtue, hopes and happiness of the nations over whom they have established their authority. But when Dr. Clarke takes ground that all these mythologies were divinely-appointed schoolmasters to bring men to Christ, preparations for Christianity — and, if we read him aright, this is substantially his view — when he teaches that the authors of these heathen mythologies were really inspired, and their religions as truly revelations from God as Christianity, the difference being not in kind, but in measure only — in a word, when "divine" "inspiration," and similar terms are applied as freely to the religions of Zoroaster, Confucius, Buddha and Mohammed, as to the religion of Christ, we find ourselves brought to a stand, and unable to see our way through the gathering mist and fog.

That all these religions have some measure of truth in them, some fragments of primeval revelation, is not to be denied. No creed, no mythology could maintain itself in being for any length of time which did not enshrine within the body of its falsehood some soul of truth, however infinitesimal. And doubtless all truth followed back to the beginning will be found to have its source in God, whether spiritual or ethical. But it is not these fragments of truth which make up the substance of, and give form and spirit to these ethnic religions; but the errors, the cruel and vindictive dogmas, the foul sensualism, and the monstrous abominations with which corrupt men long ago smothered and buried up the truth, the heaven-born child that was never suffered to grow up and unfold into maturity. These it is which impart tone and character to the pagan systems, determine their teachings and aims, and clothe them in the dress in which they come to the common people, to the millions who look to them as their sole guide, help and comfort amid the temptations and sorrows and mysteries of life.

This is the practical view of the matter, whatever our theory may require us to say of their origin. And when we come to the actual results in the daily life of the people, we cannot but think that as "schoolmasters" they are very unsafe, very little likely to give their votaries a thorough preparation for the school of Christ. Dr. Clarke says:

"When the Christian missionaries shall go and say to the Hindoos or the Buddhists; 'You are already on your way toward God, your religion came from Him, and was inspired by His Spirit; now He sends you something more and higher by His Son, who does not come

to destroy but to fulfil; not to take away any good thing you have, but to add to it something better, then we shall see the process of conversion, checked in the ninth and tenth centuries, reinaugurated.'"

Now it seems to us that if the missionary should go to these people with such a message, it would be substantially a falsehood. Certainly neither Brahmanism nor Buddhism can be said to come from God, or to be inspired of him, in any just and true sense of the word. It is not to the point to say that there is some truth in them, or that either of them teaches the doctrine of a supreme God and a certain kind of immortality — it is a totally different deity, and a totally different immortality from that revealed in the Gospel of Christ; and it is hardly consistent to believe that both doctrines are from the same divine source, or inspired by the same Holy Spirit.

Mr. Clarke seems in his presentation of the subject to overlook the difference between the esoteric and the exoteric elements of these religions; or perhaps more exactly, the difference between what the priests believed and taught the initiated or educated few, and what they taught to the masses. We know that what was disclosed in the Egyptian, Greek and Roman mysteries was one thing, and what was taught to the common people, the ignorant rabble, quite another thing. So the faith of the Brahmins, of the higher castes among the Hindoos, was something altogether different from the coarse fibre of the popular creed.

Now suppose the missionary should go to *these* Hindoos — and it is exactly to these that he should go, and mostly must go — in the midst of their abominable idolatries, sacrificing their children to the Ganges, burning widows on the funeral pile, throwiug themselves under the car of Juggernaut, revelling in the sensualism and debauchery of his infernal worship — and say to them, "You are already on your way to God, your religion came from him, and was inspired by his Spirit"! what manner of truth would there be in such a message? and how many such messages would it take to lift them out of their wallowing to the "something better" which he might offer them? — to the Christianity of Christ?

Such teaching might, to be sure, "reinaugurate the process of conversion checked in the ninth and tenth centuries" — for it was precisely this mixture of things earthly and heavenly, this compound of Christian and heathen dogmas, rites and festivals, by which the pagan tribes were attracted and converted to the *Church* rather than to

Christianity; but it would be a long time, we think, before it would lead the Hindoo millions to the sublime faith and the holy life required by the Gospel.

On one other point we wish to speak briefly, and we cannot, perhaps, do it more carefully and tenderly than in the words of the *Christian Register:*

"Dr. Clarke believes and preaches the Christianity of the New Testament, — that which is not so much comprised in the teachings, as embodied in the life, miracles, death and resurrection of Jesus. This historical Christianity is in our time called in question, denied, ridiculed by many who yet term themselves Christians. If a man sincerely receives the Jesus of the Evangelists as a real personage, is it not incumbent on him to bear testimony to this faith on all suitable occasions? The book before us lacks this testimony. It might have been written by a learned and reverent disciple of (so-called) naturalism. We are by no means solicitous that one should keep himself perpetually on the defence against heresy. But in a book, which treats of Christianity under various and numerous aspects, and which compares it with other religions bristling all over with the supernatural, we might not unfairly expect some hint as to the author's actual belief or disbelief in the works above nature ascribed by the sacred writers to their Lord and Master. Especially when such terms as "divine" and "inspiration" are freely applied to the ethnic religions, we crave some distinct recognition of those outward phenomena, which — in the apprehension of Christians generally — set Christianity apart from the religions of Greece and India, China and Persia, and make its Founder *authoritatively* divine, its teachings *labelled* inspirations."

And now let us say, notwithstanding the exceptions taken, we cordially commend the book to our readers. Preachers will find it almost an encyclopædia in regard to the history and teachings of the various religions reviewed; and a great help in the study of comparative theology, and of the influence of doctrines on the character, morals and happiness of their believers. It is a storehouse of information gathered from years of patient inquiry and study, from a wide range of reading, and often of books not readily accessible to the general reader, or even to the theological student. Very many of the facts and statements regarding these ethnic religions will be entirely new to a majority of those who, it is hoped, will read the volume.

Then the argument showing the vast superiority of Christianity over all other religions, is wrought out by Dr. Clarke with great clearness and force in all its various details, and will prove a most profitable

study of itself. The reader sees distinctly that the religion of the New Testament covers all the possibilities of human experience. Man's needs, hopes, desires, development, and future progress and perfection are amply provided for in the revelations, doctrines, promises and precepts of that Gospel which is good tidings of great joy unto all people.

The Quarterlies and Magazines.

THE July *Methodist Quarterly* has an interesting and very fair article on the "Doctrinal Phases of Universalism during the Past Century." The writer, as a reply to our assertions respecting the doctrinal changes of Orthodoxy, sets forth the changes in our denominational views from those of Murray and Winchester to those of Ballou and Balfour, and from these to what he says, quoting from Dr. Ballou in the *Quarterly*, Vol. v., is "the current opinion," viz: that there is "a moral connection of the present life with the future." He criticises, also, the statements of Rev. Adin Ballou in the *Universalist* of February last, who declared Murray a Restorationist, "notwithstanding the assertion was ably and unanswerably refuted by Rev. Thomas Whittemore by abundant quotations from Murray's writings, thirty or forty years ago."

There is an excellent digest of the extraordinary history of George Müller in the "Life of Trust." We have long had the leading facts of his story in hand, intending to give them to the readers of *our Quarterly*, but this paper presents them in such a well-arranged and compact form that we may, with the editor's permission, borrow it in in part.

We frequently allude to the *one stone* thrown at Murray through the window of the church on School St., and sometimes grow pathetic over the persecutions and perils of the early Universalists. The following from an article on "Wesley and Methodism" will show how the early Methodists fared in England:

"Wild bulls were driven into the gatherings of hearers in order to break up the meetings; petards and squibs were thrown among them; stones were hurled upon the roofs of houses for the purpose of injuring the preacher. The magistrates were not inclined to extend their protection to these peaceful assemblies; they naturally sided with the clergy, and were encouraged in their neglect and indifference by the declamatory opposition of these latter. To this day the register of

the parish of Poole bears record of the expenses of certain churchwardens, payable to the inn-keeper of the place, said expenses being incurred for the purpose of chasing out the Methodists. In certain towns the people organized themselves for this commendable work, and the mob was master of the place for several days. At Walsal a placard was posted, announcing a certain day "for the destruction of the Methodists." Another placard at Wednesbury offered a reward of five hundred pounds sterling for their expulsion."

Old and New for September has the best *resumé* of the Paraguay question — or, rather, the best epitome of the history of this country and its rulers — which has yet fallen within our notice. It is founded on Mr. Washburne's book, and, we believe, gives a true presentation of the monster Lopez, notwithstanding the protest of the *Liberal Christian.* One fact is enough — if it be a fact — a population of 800,000, reduced to 80,000, largely by the cruelties and butcheries of this one human wild beast!

Beside this article on Paraguay, there is a notable paper on "Immortality," from which we would be glad to make generous extracts; and another on "St. Jerome," which gives a very attractive sketch of the man and his literary labors — the man who in the 4th century renounced his Universalism (in words) to gratify a personal pique. The historical value of "Looking Across the War-Gulph" demands for it, when finished, a book form.

The *Catholic World* is one of the ablest of our American reviews; narrow in its dogmatic and ecclesiastical drift, but carrying evident marks of close thinking and study, and of large acquaintance with the theological, philosophical and scientific questions at present agitating the religious mind. Its editor and many of its correspondents are men of eminent ability and scholarship. Of course, with all of them the Church is supreme authority, "and competent to decide whether any alledged scientific discoveries are or are not favorable to religion, and must necessarily have the right to decide prior to all scientific investigation — and if it decide that this or that theory is unfavorable to religion, we as religious men must pronounce it false, and refuse to entertain it."

In a well prepared paper reviewing "Christianity and Positivism," by Dr. McCosh, in the October number, there are many passages deserving attention:

"No doubt the miracles are provable by simple historical testimony by and to one who knows nothing of the Christian plan, or of its su-

pernatural character: but to the unbelievers of our time it is necessary to set forth, in its unity and catholicity, the Christian *schema*, if we may be allowed the term, and to show that miracles themselves have their reason or law in the divine plan or decree, and are no more anomalies, in relation to that plan or decree, or *ex parte Dei*, than are earthquakes and volcanoes. It is only in this way we can satisfy the demand for order and regularity. The unbeliver may not be able to resist the testimony which proves the miracle a fact, but till we show him that in a miracle the natural laws are not violated, or that nature does not go out of her course, as he imagines, we cannot satisfy him that he can yield to the miracle without surrendering his natural reason and the law and order of the universe.

"The prejudice against the supernatural must be removed as the preliminary work, and this can only be done by presenting Christianity as a whole in its unity and catholicity, and showing that, according to it, the supernatural or Christian order enters into the original decree of God, and is necessary to complete what is initial in the cosmos, or to perfect the natural order, and to enable it to fulfil the purpose for which it exists, or realize its destiny or final cause, in which is its beatitude or supreme good.

Again the writer says, in regard to the existence of God,

"We agree with the traditionist, not indeed that the existence of God cannot be proved by reason prior to faith, but that, as a fact, God revealed himself to man before his expulsion from the garden; and the belief, clear and distinct, or dim and confused, in the divine being, universally diffused among all races and conditions of men, originated in revelation and is due to the tradition, pure or impure, in its integrity, or mutilated and corrupted, of the primitive revelation made by God himself to man. In this way the fact of the universality of the belief in some form is a valid argument for the truth of the belief, and we thus obtain a historical argument to corroborate the already conclusive ideal or metaphysical argument, the principles of which we have given."

The articles on "Egyptian Civilization, according to the most Recent Discoveries," are popular in character, and full of curious and pleasing information. The Egyptian laws proscribed idleness as a social evil, and obliged every man to show annually to the governor of his province his means of subsistence (women were not excepted); and they who did not obey, or who could not show that they were living on legitimate resources, were punished with death! This law would be fatal to multitudes in our day.

"'He who saw on the way a man struggling with an assassin, or enduring violent treatment, and did not aid him when in his power, was

condemned to death.' 'He who had wilfully murdered a free man or a slave was punished with death, for the laws wished to punish, not according to the degree of rank, but the intention of the evil-doer.'

"The law respecting loans was no less remarkable. It was forbidden those who lent by contract to allow the principal to more than double by the accumulation of the interest. Creditors who demanded pay could only seize the goods of the debtor. Bodily restraint was never allowed, for the law regarded the individual as belonging to the state, which, at any moment, might claim his services in war or in peace."

"Egyptians had an efficacious means of ensuring the payment of debts — in depriving those of sepulture who died without satisfying their creditors. In such a case the body, after being embalmed, was simply deposited in the house of the deceased and left to the children. 'It sometimes happened,' says Diodorus,' 'that, owing to the prevailing respect for the memory of parents, the grandchildren, becoming wealthier, paid the debts of their ancestor, had the decree of condemnation revoked, and gave him a magnificent funeral.' The same author adds, 'It is common to give the body of a deceased parent as the guarantee of a debt. The greatest infamy and privation of sepulture awaited those who did not redeem such a pledge.'"

The *Atlantic* maintains its well-earned reputation and popularity, notwithstanding its numerous rivals. The October number has a paper on "The Intermingling of Religions," which contains in a condensed and compact form a large amount of useful and attractive information. The following extract will show this, and also the source of many of the corruptions of Christianity:

"Festivals that were universally observed, and endeared to the populace by long habit and as occasions for social gatherings, were generally retained by the Christian Church, thongh the old forms were consecrated to new ideas. Almost all the ancient nations hailed the return of the sun from the winter solstice by a great festival on the 25th of December, during which they performed religious ceremonies in honor of the sun, feasted each other and interchanged gifts. To have abolished this day would have been as unpopular among the masses of Gentile proselytes as the abolition of Thanksgiving day would be in New England. It was accordingly retained as the birthday of the "Sun of Righteousness," concerning whose real birthday history leaves us entirely in the dark.

"The ancient Germans observed in the early spring a festival in honor of Ostera, who was probably their goddess of Nature or of the earth. Scholars derive her name from Oster, which signifies rising. The festival was to hail the rising of Nature from her winter sleep. Oster-fires were kindled in honor of the returning warmth, and Oster-eggs were exchanged; the egg being an ancient and very common

symbol of fecundity, or germinating life, Teutonic converts to Christianity were allowed to keep up their old festival. but they were taught to do it in honor of the rising of Jesus, instead of the rising of Nature. Easter-fires are still kindled, and Easter-eggs, variously ornamented, are still exchanged in several Catholic countries. Almost all ancient nations had a great festival in the spring. The Jewish Passover occurred at that season. Converts from all nationions were well satisfied to keep up their old holiday and accept its new significance."

Religious World.

RECENT accounts from Scotland do not show a very satisfactory state of morals among the people. A Report of the "Committee on Temperance" presented to the General Assembly of the Established Church at Edinburgh shows that there are in that city twenty-eight breweries, employing from 150 to 200 men, who work two or three hours Sunday mornings and evenings. One large distillery employs an equal number, most of whom work until 12 o'clock at noon on Sundays. Scotland has nearly 13,000 houses licensed for the sale of ardent spirits, or one for every fifty families. Of these Edinburgh has 850. The Committee on "Religion and Morals" state that for the quarter ending on the 31st December, 1870, the illegitimate births in the county of Dumfries were 13.4 per cent., and in that of Kirkcudbright 20.3. Within the synod of Glasgow and Ayr, the "general community" are remarkable for "profane swearing, intemperance and uncleanness." Such a record as this would seem to indicate that Calvinism, whatever else may be said of it, is not specially productive of sound morality; and that the dogma of endless torment, even when preached in all its heathen savageness, does not exert the extraordinary influence claimed for it. Compare Edinburgh with Gloucester in our own state, where Universalism prevails to such an extent, and John Calvin will not have much whereof to boast against John Murray.

— At a Rabbinical conference held in Cincinnati, a report was adopted acknowledging that the Israelites must have ministers to teach and preach in the English language, and recommending the establishment of a rabbinical college. A modern prayer-book is to be furnished, in which all allusion to the return of the Jews to Jerusalem, of the ideas of sacrifices and a personal Messiah, are to be omitted; the service to be largely in the vernacular instead of the Hebrew

language; a more complete Sabbath-school organization is to be effected, and the establishment of circuit preaching is said to have been determined on.

—Some of the German ultramontanes are carrying on the warfare against Dr. Dollinger and his followers in a way to help rather than hinder them; if we may judge from the following letter, written by three priests to the people of a village in Austria, who had received a priest forbidden to preach because he could not accept the dogma of Infallibility:

"Praised be Jesus Christ. Penzing has already been heavily visited by the chastising hand of God (through the rinderpest), and this parish, which might be so happy, may be punished far more, if the accursed, perjured priest, Alois Anton, should remain longer in your midst. Such a mangy sheep as this thoroughly corrupt man, who fled the diocese of Linz in order to escape the bolt of excommunication of his holy bishop, which would have hurled him to hell, — fled, we say, as once the fratricide Cain fled after his devilish deed, — such a monster can bring to a parish in which he finds home and sympathy, nothing but God's curse. Therefore, honest Catholics of Penzing, if you will save you and yours, endeavor, by the use of all means not actually forbidden, to banish this agent of hell, Alois Anton, from among you. For he is only a seducer and a murderer of your immortal souls, which are created for true happiness here and eternal bliss hereafter. Therefore, away with this wretch from among you."

— The account of Paul's visit to Ephesus, of the riot raised by Demetrius and the silversmiths, "which made silver shrines for Diana," as given in Acts xix., and the world-wide fame of the magnificent temple of this goddess, which was the pride and boast of the Ephesians, will give interest to the fact that the excavations which have been going on for some time past, have led to some interesting discoveries respecting the great temple of Diana, the wonders of which Pliny said it would take a book to describe. By sinking holes through the rubbish and vegetation which cover the area in which it stood, the pavement of the temple was discovered, together with *frustra* of columns of white marble, and two capitals, all of colossal dimensions; and now the remains of one of the external columns, measuring rather more than six feet in diameter, have been found *in situ*. Here we are on New Testament ground again.

— How they manage heretics in Scotland has recently been illustrated in what has been called "the great Dalkeith heresy case." A

Rev. Mr. Ferguson was moved to shake off the yoke of his bondage, but after long trial and learned discussions, was finally "disciplined" and worried into the following creed, which result, the Moderator said, "had scattered for them an apparently dark cloud." Another of the doctors pronounced it "a harmonious and happy result," notwithstanding the would-be heretic qualified his assent with the statement that "he still holds all the interpretations of Scripture given by him from the pulpit, and understands that his liberty as a minister of the Gospel, to speak according to his own light, conscience, and sense of responsibility, remains unimpaird." It may be taken, therefore, as representing the present position of Scotch theology:

"1. That all who shall ultimately be saved were chosen of God in Christ before the foundation of the world.

2. That all who are saved are accepted of God 'by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,' at or before the time of their death; and that none dying unsaved will, after death, have an opportunity of obtaining salvation.

3. That whatever new revelations of Christ or of the truth are made after death to the saved are made, not to free them from sin, but to increase their knowledge and blessedness.

4. That, notwithstanding the inability of the will through sin, as taught in our Confession, unbelievers are fully answerable for their rejection of the offer of salvation which the Gospel makes to them."

—According to the Canton correspondent of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, the Chinese Government has acted up to the warnings given in its recent diplomatic circular by anti-missionary decrees of an unmistakable character. For the future, no township or parish is to be responsible for the loss or damage which missionaries may receive. The authors of crimes are to be punished, but no compensation can be demanded for the destruction of property, the robbery of movables, &c. All foreign women are to be banished, "inasmuch as female missionaries can produce nothing but evil effects on the female sex and on society in China," and native women are rigidly prohibited from attending Christian meetings. Pagan children must on no account frequent Christian schools. The reception of converts is limited. There is also a number of cumbrous regulations regarding the exact registration of all changes of religion.

—After reading the following, one might conclude that the Buddhists could not find a more inviting field for their missionary labor than Rome and its papal population, or perhaps even Paris and its

authorities. A Hungarian Roman Catholic priest writes to the *Presburg Gazette* a curious account of a visit paid by him to the Church of St. Augustine, from which the record below is taken:

"When I entered, there appeared to be no one in the building, but an old barefooted sacristan soon appeared and offered (of course for a small consideration) to let me see the marvellous relics the church possessed. Having conducted me into the sacrisry he showed me, on a rich velvet cushion enclosed in a small glass case, the cord with which Judas Iscariot had hanged himself. My cicerone maintained the relic to be authenic, and I could not hurt his feelings by an expression of doubt. Another glass case contains a wing of the Archangel Gabriel. I learned on inquiry that Pope Gregory VII. had obtained this gift from the angel by his prayers, and my guide informed me, with a look of deep significance, that he knew a pious man, the possessor of a feather from this angelic wing, who would be happy to dispose of it in favor of another devout man. As I did not take the hint, we continued our examination of the reliquary. I was next shown tne comb of the cock that crowed when Peter denied his Master, then the staff with which Moses divided the waters of the Red Sea, and afterwards the beard of Noah. My cicerone took care to inform me, every now and again, that in consideration my being a 'pious man,' I could obtain a small portion of these invaluable relics at a very moderate price."

And that this kind of religious farce is not confined to the ignorant rabble, is plain from the following. Among the curious letters brought to light in ransacking the Tuileries during the recent French Revolution, was the letter given below. It was addressed to Louis Napoleon and written by M. Louvat, a member of the Corps Législatif, and dated Dec. 17, 1855, shortly before the birth of the Prince Imperial:

"Sire: The church of Puy-Notre-Dame, near Saumur, possesses one of the most precious of Christian relics. It is a sash of the Virgin Mary, given by William VI., Duke of Aquitaine, who had brought it back from the Crusades. The archives of the church, and numerous historical documents, attest the authenticity of this relic. The kings of France have at all times had great faith in this sash. Anne of Austria wore it at St. Germain in 1628, when she gave birth to a prince who was afterwards Louir XIV. If it seemed good to you, Sire, to place her Majesty the Empress under the protection of this relic during the great event which is going to crown your domestic happiness, and assure the repose of France, I have no doubt the curé and the bishop would eagerly accede to your wishes."

We are not told whether Eugenie wore the sash or not, but being

[illegible] she did. A farther evidence [illegible] and blasphemies are accepted, or sus- [illegible] even in our own country, may be found [illegible] in the September *Catholic World*, evidently by [illegible] attempting to prove the Liquefaction of the [illegible] St. Januarius a genuine miracle, repeated from year to year!

The *Jewish Messenger* says: "The Talmud is not yet over- [illegible] — the most earnest and indefatigable reform leader in [illegible] is constantly urging the study of the ancient Jewish writers, [illegible] surpassed by no conservative preacher in the resolution with which he presents his views. The chief reformers of Germany, clerical and lay, are revising the study of Hebrew literature at the same time that the staunch old orthodox rabbis are kindling anew the supposed dying embers of Talmudical learning. New translations of the Talmud in French and English are among the latest ventures, demonstrating a genuine revival of interest in these studies. The articles in the English reviews prove that in Great Britain, too, there is renewed inquiry in the like direction." In this connection we may mention the fact, that the only paper *printed in Hebrew* is published at Lyck, in East Prussia, now in its fourteenth year. It has a specially large circulation in Russia, where it is doing a great work in the enlightenment and social elevation of the Russian Jews.

—A curious discovery has been made by the Abbé Richard who is at the present making explorations in the Holy Land. A letter has been received from him, which appears in the Ultramontane journal, *Les Mondes*. From it we learn that stone knives having been frequently found in the plains of Jordan, the Abbé had a strong desire to connect them with sacred history. In the Book of Joshua, fifth chapter, second verse, we read, "At that time the Lord said unto Joshua, Make thee sharp knives, and circumcise again the children of Israel the second time." In June last the Abbé Richard, accompanied by the Abbé Pascal and a sheik, visited Joshua's tomb at Timnath-Serah. They found it filled with *débris*, but having penetrated the niches of the tomb (fifteen in number) on their hands and knees, they were rewarded by finding numerous flint knives which had undoubtedly been used by the Jewish priests in circumcising the Israelites.

—The following are the religious statistics of Germany: Protestants, 24,253,018, of whom 20,473,000 belong to the old North German Confederation, 1,233,900 to Bavaria, 1,200,300 to Wurtemburg, 558,560 to Hesse, 472,258 to Baden. Catholics, 14,551,651, of whom 7,800,000 are in Prussia, 3,176,400 in Bavaria, 993,476 in Baden, 533,695 in Wurtembug. Jews and others, 1,327,330.

— Our Buddhist friends are beginning to interest themselves in the welfare and salvation Christians. The King of Burmah has informed Max Muller, through his Prime Minister, that he is printing a complete edition of the "Three Beedaghats" (the Tripitaka) in Pali, the sacred language of Buddhism, with a view to having it afterwards translated into Burmese and English, "so as to spread the knowlege of the Buddhist religion both in Europe and America, and that the English people may become acquainted with the principles of the Buddhist faith, and thus cause their kingdom to become famous in the world's history."

In this connection we may give the following respecting a remarkable work which has been going on during the last four years in Ceylon, viz., the revision of all the Buddhist sacred books, with their commentaries:

"In the year 1867, through the exertions of a Simhalese noble,-man, a synod of the Buddhist priests was convened for the purpose of correcting the Tripitaka, and this synod, composed of priests selected for their learning and scholarship from the principal Ceylon monasteries, has met from time to time, collating MSS. and discussing doubtful readings. The first session of the synod lasted seven months, and was devoted to the Vinaya. The next meeting was held after a considerable interval, and was devoted to the correction of the Sutra Pitak. The Abhidharma Pitaka is now undergoing revision, and the labors of the synod are drawing to a close. When they are completed, a palm-leaf copy of the authorised version of the sacred texts will be deposited in one of the Ceylon monasteries, and the public will be permitted to inspect and transcribe the different books."

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

1. The Sword and Garment. A Plea for Ministerial Culture. By Rev. L. T. Townsend, author of "Credo," etc. Lee & Shephard. $1.50.

An odd title for a very useful and suggestive book. The author writes with great earnestness and enthusiasm, and sometimes with a plainness which almost amounts to severity. His object is to point out that "culture for Christian thought, and that training for Christian work, which are in harmony with science, criticism, literature, and the social and moral ideas of the times." And he thinks that there

would be no timidity or hesitation in grappling with all the doubts and difficulties started by philosophy or science, if only the pulpit is thoroughly prepared, the minister trained to his work by an education which touches all branches of human knowledge. He would have the preacher not only a man of the highest spiritual type, not only a theologian and Biblical critic, but a scholar among scholars, a thoroughbred student of ancient history, familiar with every department of natural science, not ignorant of the principles on which rests the science of law, government and political economy, and well read in the elements which lie at the basis of the ancient and modern civilizations.

This will seem to some young men, in a hurry to enter the pulpit, a large demand upon their labor and patience; but after all, this is the temper of the times. "Traditions and reverence for 'the man of God,' have resolutely protected many a one in the pulpit, who would have fallen flat on the platform or at the bar. But the day of this divine interference and defence is passing. Special talents and not the garb, other things being equal, are now to win as elsewhere, so in the pulpit. The mere *garb* has lost its charm. The clerical office must henceforth stand upon real merit." Mr. Townsend, in saying this, simply gives expression to the fast-growing convictions of those who compose most of our congregations, especially the younger portion, among whom so largely now we find that culture which is the fruit of a collegiate or academic training, and which justly demands a corresponding culture in the pulpit. And that pulpit which fails to meet this demand surely surrenders its power and influence, and cultivated minds turn elsewhere for instruction and guidance.

But it is not only in a general literary way that the people are rapidly passing beyond the old standard of demand and expectation from the pulpit, but even in the matter of Biblical study and interpretation; for, as our author says, "in knowledge of the Bible and its truths there are those in the pews who are silently advancing beyond those in the pulpit" — or perhaps, more exactly, beyond *some* of those in the pulpit.

Beside the matter of a higher education for the minister, there are in the book many other things respecting preaching and sermons and pastoral labor, and the duties and responsibilities of the people, which should receive attention from preachers who wish to do justice to their hearers, and from congregations wishing to help their pastors in their endeavors after usefulness and success.

2. Behind the Bars — or Life in an Insane Asylum. Lee & Shepard. $2.00.

A much needed book, which ought to have been written long ago; for the outrages committed in Asylums for the Insane are not all confined to the old world, nor are the infamous agencies by which people of sound mind are forced into these institutions. It is evident that this work is written by one who has suffered directly, or through the sufferings of others, from the abuses described in its pages. It will

be read with painful interest by those who have seen friends or acquaintances or relations put Behind the Bars because it was convenient to have them out of the way; or because an affinity had been found in some spiritual circle, or some similar iniquity was to be covered up; or because some expectant heirs were in haste to manage the property, and imprisonment in an insane asylum might hasten the death they were tired of waiting for; or because, owing to some other disease or infirmity, the care of them had become irksome, and it was not difficult, for a consideration, to obtain a physician's certificate for their removal.

And the story of life in these institutions ought to be written out; for friends, who in good faith take the really insane to these asylums, do not know what kind of a life they are taking them to. Of course every one knows how difficult it is to make out a case of abuse, for the victims cannot be believed, all their solemn asservations being regarded as only just proofs of their insanity; and relatives and friends are assured that their visits and interviews are sure to increase the paroxysms and retard the cure; and employes, to whom, indeed, these abuses are sometimes chargeable, know well enough, when the fault is not their own, that their place depends on their silence.

Of course, these statement are not of universal application. There are, as we personally know, honorable exceptions. But after all that can be said in reply to this book — whose statements find abundant confirmation in certain articles which appeared in the *Atlantic* two or three years ago — we say to all, unless your safety is endangered, never send one you love to a private or a public insane asylum.

The volume should have titles to the chapters, or a table of contents, or an index of subjects, or something to guide one in haste in finding a particular passage or statement.

3. Culture and Religion in some of their Relations. By J. C. Sharp, Principal of the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard.

This is a timely book, full of clear, sound thought, presented in an easy and attractive style. It is admirably addressed to students, and will be read with interest by all honest, religious thinkers who may give their attention to it. The author is well qualified for the work he undertakes, which is to show that there can be no true and complete culture unless the religious has rule and supremacy in the mind and affections. The statement of Mr. Huxley's failure to recognize "that there is an open path between the soul and God," is well made; and the chapters on "Hindrances to Spiritual Growth" and "The Combination of Religion and Culture," are full of practical suggestions. The author's inability to find light in view of the problem of evil as connected with the human will, is one of the many evidences of the unsatisfactory nature of all theology that is not based on the universalism of the New Testament. That "Scripture affords no solution of this great perplexity," is untrue. The Scriptures are given us that we through their testimony may have hope in that Paternal Love

which is to subdue all opposing wills to its own. Notwithstanding this defect, as we regard it, in the author's theology, we most heartily welcome his book, and commend it all who may read this notice of it. J. G. A.

4. Pink and White Tyranny. By Mrs. H. B. Stowe. Boston. Roberts Brothers. 12 mo. $1.50.

It is seldom that we can say of a work of fiction what we are glad to say of this — that it is useful, much needed, noble in purpose, fiction only in form but history in fact, full of wisdom, sharply rebuking the folly and wickedness of fashion, its moral and religious lessons made as attractive as they are impressive — in a word, a book which ought to be read by men and women of every rank and condition; and being read, and heeded, would do a work second only in importance to "Uncle Tom's Cabin." In noticing and cordially commending such a book as this, we do not go beyond the legitimate aims of the *Quarterly;* for we feel that it is simply commending a praiseworthy and successful attempt to honor true morality and piety, to bring into light the temptations and dangers of a fashionable life, to rebuke the growing disposition to think and speak lightly of the ties and obligations of marriage and the sanctities of domestic life, to show the need of a higher moral element in the education of our young women; or, to put it all into one phrase, to enforce the doctrine that Christian principle should be the supreme guide of thought, feeling and action.

We have not much room for extracts, but we cannot refuse place to the following on a subject so much debated, talked and written about, and yet so little understood in its most important bearing on woman and her offspring:

"It has been very surprising to us to see in these our times that some people, who really at heart have the interest of women more their minds, have been so short-sighted and reckless as to clamor for an easy dissolution of the marriage contract, as a means of righting their wrongs. Is it possible that they do not see that this is a liberty which, once granted, would always tell against the weaker sex? If the woman who finds that she has made a mistake, and married a man unkind or uncongenial, may, on the discovery of it, leave him, and seek her fortune with another, so also may a man. And what will become of women like Lillie, when the first gilding begins to wear off, if the men who have taken them shall be at liberty to cast them off and seek others? Have we not enough now of miserable, broken-winged butterflies, that sink down, down, down into the mud of the street? But are women-reformers going to clamor for having every woman turned out helpless, when the man who has married her, and made her a mother, discovers that she has not the power to interest him, and to help his higher spiritual development? It is because woman is helpless and weak, and because Christ was her great Protector, that he made the law of marriage irrevocable: 'Whosoever putteth away his wife causeth her to commit adultery.' If the sacredness of the marriage contract did not hold, if the Church and all good men and all good women did not uphold it with their might and main, it is easy to see where the career of many women like Lillie would end."

5. Reindeer, Dogs and Snow-Shoes. A Journal of Siberian Travel and Explorations made in the years 1865–67. By Richard J. Bush, late of the Russo-American Telegraph Expedition. With Illustrations. Harper & Brothers. 8 vo. $3.00.

A book whose title does not do justice to the pleasing, informing and really valuable matter filling its pages. It is a fresh contribution

toward the history of the earth and the human race; being not only a record of travel and adventure, and a repository of important facts for science, geography and natural history, but also a picture of life, manners, customs, religions and superstitions among tribes of men of whom hitherto almost nothing has been known. A large portion of the region traversed has never before been explored by civilized man, and therefore a special interest and importance attach to all the author has to communicate respecting the countries and the people visited.

If some of the tribes mentioned began as savages, some thousands of years ago, we can only say that they have not gained much in the interval. The doctrine of necessary development and progress, obedient to the law of human nature, without divine assistance of any sort, gets very little illustration or encouragement from the present condition of these miserable races. On the other hand, if their ancestors, far back toward the beginning of the world, began with all the advantages of revelation and civilization given of God, this wretched degradation, social and religious, only shows how far into the depths man may sink when left to the guidance of that reason so glorified in these days as sufficient for all human needs and growth to perfection.

The following example of the domestic customs of the *Gilacks*, a superstitious pagan people, will illustrate one phase of natural growth. Compare it with the conduct of the male lion under similar circumcumstances:

"During parturition, whether in winter or summer, the unfortunate mother is ejected from her habitation — thrust out of doors, exposed to the inclemency of the weather, there to provide for herself as best she may, solitary and ignored, until a certain period shall have elapsed. During this time every possible assistance is denied her, it being considered almost criminal to lend her the slightest attention, and, as a natural consequence, death often ensues."

These Gilacks burn the bodies of their dead, and then erect a wooden house or tomb over the ashes. At death, the soul is supposed to take up its abode in the favorite dog of the deceased, where it remains until released from its confinement by the death of the animal. To facilitate its escape, it has become customary to sacrifice the dog at the tomb of its master, the creature being first fattened for the occasion.

The following will show that even where there is a revelation, if it be not heeded, if the wisdom of this world which is earthly, sensual, devilish, is allowed to displace the wisdom from above, any depth of superstition and vileness is possible. The author is describing a Russian priest, who is a drunkard and a gambler, and whom he declares, unfairly, it is to be hoped, a representative of his class. This priest was gambling with the governor, and tells the author how he won a hundred roubles:

"At the commencement of the game, the priest had drawn a hideous picture of his Satanic Majesty on the lower side of the paper upon which the record of the game was kept, and, from superstitious motives, had placed that side of the paper next the ispravnik (governor), believing that it would cause him ill luck. As the game progressed, contrary to his expectations, the ispravnik won so steadily that the priest be-

came at once satisfied that, on turning the picture from himself, he had injured his own fortune. While his competitor was not observing, he made three crosses upon the forehead of the picture, and having *kissed and christened it the Almighty*, turned it next himself: from that moment he claimed that his fortune changed."

6. Art: Its Laws and the Reasons for Them. Collected, condensed and arranged for General Educational Purposes. By Samuel P. Long, Counsellor-at-Law, Student of the English Royal Academy, and Pupil of the late Gilbert Stuart Newton, R. A., with Steel Engravings and Wood-cuts. Lee & Shepard. $3.00.

This work deserves a more appreciative notice than we are able to give it. It does for Art what the Grammar and the Lexicon do for Language, and does it admirably, too. One who is in earnest may with the help it affords learn the principles of art much in the same way in which he would acquire the knowledge of a foreign tongue. A competent judge, George B. Emerson, says, "I believe that any person who should carefully read it would so understand the principles, and have his eyes opened to the beauties of Art that he would never look upon a picture, a statue, or a noble building, without more interest and a higher power of appreciating and enjoying it."

The essay on "Personal Beauty," which is a wonderfully interesting work of itself alone, and ought to be studied for its own sake, is followed by others on Different Classes of Painting, Design and Drawing, Invention, Composition, Chiaro-Oscuro and Color. Then come chapters devoted to the great Masters and Schools — Michael Angelo and Raphael, Titian and Correggio, Reynolds, West, &c., which are not only valuable to the art-student for their criticisms and clear exhibitions of the peculiarities of the several schools, but exceedingly interesting to the general reader for their biographical information and curious anecdotes, illustrating the genius and character of these distinguished masters. The pages on architecture, the engravings, and the list of the principal pictures of the great artists, add greatly to the usefulness and convenience of this beautiful volume.

7. The Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson. Compiled from Family Letters and Reminiscences. By his Great Grand-daughter, Sarah N. Randolph. Harper & Brothers.

We begin by commending this book to all our readers as one of the most agreeable and instructive volumes of the day — one that should be read both for its pleasing information touching the character, domestic life, studious habits, and personal peculiarities of the author of the Declaration of Independence; and for its many valuable suggestions regarding the education and training of children and young people.

Mr. Jefferson's letters to his daughters are models of their kind, and reveal to us his wisdom, excellent judgment, prudence, patience and never-wearying affection for his family; show us how well it is to talk and write sensibly and wisely even to young children, and seek to raise them to our level instead of coming down by nonsense and foolish babble to what is supposed to be their level. And it is a marvel that amid the immense labors laid upon him as lawyer, statesman, leg-

islator, Chief Magistrate of the nation, Governor of Virginia, Foreign Minister, and Founder and Rector of the University of Virginia, he never failed to send the expected letters to his daughters and kindred. No matter how great the strain upon his brain, or how numerous the calls upon his time, he always remembered and gratified the wishes of the dear ones at home. This is one of the most prominent and engaging features of his character. Fathers and mothers whose sons and daughters are at school, or away from home, will find it to their profit to peruse the delightful and suggestive letters which fill so many pages of this book, and thus learn how to write to them useful and instructive epistles.

His tact and good judgment in the management of his daughters are seen in the following incident. When Minister to France, his daughter Martha was sent to school at a convent just outside of Paris. One day he was startled by receiving a note from her requesting permission to enter the convent, and spend the rest of her days in the discharge of the duties of a religious life:

"He did not reply to the note, but after a day or two, drove to the Abbaye, had a private interview with the Abbess, and then asked for his daughters. He received them with more than usual affectionate warmth of manner, and without making the least allusion to Martha's note or its contents, told his daughters that he had come to take them from school, and accordingly he drove back home, accompanied by them. No word in allusion to the subject ever passed between father and daughter, and it was not referred to by either of them until years afterwards, when she spoke of it to her children."

There are twenty-five or thirty of his letters we should mark for quotation if we had room. The following is a specimen of the common sense and practical wisdom with which they abound. Martha, then at school, had been somewhat troubled with certain teachings about the approaching end of the world, on learning which he writes as follows, under date of Dec. 1783:

"I hope you will have good sense enough to disregard those foolish predictions that the world is to be at an end soon. . . . As to the preparation for that event, the best way is for you always to be prepared for it. The only way for you to be so is, never to say or do a bad thing. If ever you are about to say anything amiss, or to do anything wrong, consider beforehand you will feel something within you which will tell you it is wrong, and ought not to be said or done. This is your conscience, and be sure to obey it. Our Maker has given us all this faithful internal monitor, and if you always obey it, you will always be prepared for the end of the world; or for a much more certain event, which is death. This must happen to all; it puts an end to the world as to us, and the way to be ready for it is never to do a wrong act."

Not much appears in the narrative indicative of his doctrinal belief, but the above shows his moral and religious convictions, as does also the following letter of advice to a namesake, to be kept for him until the child should come to years of understanding. It was written when Jefferson was eighty-two years of age:

"This letter will, to you, be as one from the dead. The writer will be in his grave before you can weigh its counsels. Your affectionate and excellent father has requested that I would address to you something which might possibly have a favorable influence on the course of life you have to run; and I, too, as a namesake, feel an inter-

est in that course. Few words will be necessary with good dispositions on your part. Adore God. Reverence and cherish your parents. Love your neighbor as yourself, and your country more than yourself. Be just. Be true. Murmur not at the ways of Providence. So shall the life into which you have entered be the portal to one of eternal and ineffable bliss. And if to the dead it is permitted to care for the things of this world, every action of your life will be under my regard. Farewell."

It is beautiful to learn of the friendship, and almost school-boy tenderness, which existed to the last between this venerable man and his fellow Presidents, Adams and Madison — never disturbed for a momoment by any difference of opinion on measures in politics or the conduct of national affairs. Writing to Mrs. Adams in 1817, he says, speaking of the last twenty years preceding:

"But those twenty years! Alas! where are they? With those beyond the flood. Our next meeting must then be in the country to which they have flown — a country for us not now very distant. For this journey we shall need neither gold nor silver in our purse, nor scrip, nor coats, nor staves. Nor is the provision for it more easy than the preparation has been kind. Nothing proves more than this that the Being who presides over the world is essentially benevolent — stealing from us, one by one, the faculties of enjoyment, searing our sensibilities, leading us, like the horse in his mill, round and round the beaten circle, until, fatigued with this leaden iteration, we ask our own exit."

It is painful to read the record of the pecuniary embarrassments of his last years, the result of his long and unselfish devotion to his country; and of his pathetic application to the Virginia legislature for its help to prevent his being driven into the world in his then old age, houseless and homeless. Happily he died unconscious that the sale of his property would fail to pay his debts; that his beautiful home, Monticello, the pride and joy of his heart, would pass into the hands of strangers, and his "dear and beloved daughter," penniless and almost heart-broken, see its doors closed upon her forever! All honor to South Carolina and Lousiana, which, on learning the destitute condition of Mrs. Randolph, voted and sent her ten thousand dollars each; and shame to Virginia, which looked on, talked, and did nothing.

5. Thomas Chalmers. A Biographical Study. By James Dodds. Carlton & Lanahan. $1.25

Those who have only heard of Chalmers as a marvel of pulpit oratory, or been charmed with the magnificent eloquence of his "Astronomical Sermons," will learn from this biographical sketch that he is eminent in other respects, and a man of remarkable powers as an organizer and financier. His leadership and labors in the great secession, and upbuildining of the "Free Church of Scotland," were the chief agencies in securing victory and permanent success. And the most interesting and instructive portion of the book is that which describes the secession, organization and financial triumph of the new church. The picture is admirably drawn, and is an eloquent and unanswerable reply to the sneers of those who declare that independence, conscience, and loyalty to God and Truth have died out from the

Church. The story of the "Free Church," in connection with its eloquent leader, should be read as the antidote to the "Bondage of the Pulpit" in *Scribner's Monthly*. The following paragraph refers to the famous Astronomical Sermons:

"The success was as unexpected as it was unprecedented. Nobody could be more amazed than himself and his publishers. Instead of a fair Glasgow sale, on which they had counted, the work was flying on the wings of the wind to every part of Scotland and England. It came out side by side with the 'Tales of my Landlord,' and side by side it kept — a volume of sermons running neck to neck with the magnificent 'Waverly Novels!' It passed through nine editions in one year, and 20,000 volumes were in circulation; they were the rage of the season."

9. The Federal Government: Its Officers and their Duties. By Ransom H. Gillet. Woolworth, Ainsworth & Co. New York and Chicago. 1871. 12 mo. 440 pp.

The object of this volume is pretty clearly indicated by its title. To such persons as desire a knowledge of our national government, its constitution, organization, various officers and their duties — and the number of such persons should be limited only to the intelligent citizens of the United States — the work before us must be most acceptable. Its value, of course, must depend very much on the qualifications of the author, his acquaintance with the various subjects upon which he treats, and his skill in exhibiting the facts with which he deals. Mr. Gillet seems to come to his work well prepared for it.

After completing his professional education, he was soon engaged in the political affairs of his native State of New York, and made himself familiar with its constitution and laws. Ere long he entered Congress as Representative of St. Lawrence Co. More recently he was made Register and Solicitor of the United States Treasury Department, Solicitor for the United States in the Court of Claims, etc. etc. "A long practice," he says, "in the higher national courts, and over twenty years' service in Congress and in various important official positions in the Executive Departments, have rendered me comparatively familiar with most matters pertaining to the federal government." He further tells us that he has neglected no opportunity of acquiring the desired knowledge, and having himself felt the need of such a volume, and being urged, since his retirement to prepare such a work, he now offers it to the public, in the hope that it may afford such information as many people desire, and prove generally useful.

The work is not intended to give minute information to all who hold office. Its object is to enable his readers to understand the structure of the government, what officers are employed in its practical operation, and their general duties.

Besides this useful information the volume contains a great amount of interesting and important facts, as the names of our Presidents and Vice-Presidents, the time they took their oath of office, the various Secretaries of the Departments, Judges of the Supreme Court, the public debt every year, from the organization of the government, etc. etc.

would be no timidity or hesitation in grappling with all the doubts and difficulties started by philosophy or science, if only the pulpit is thoroughly prepared, the minister trained to his work by an education which touches all branches of human knowledge. He would have the preacher not only a man of the highest spiritual type, not only a theologian and Biblical critic, but a scholar among scholars, a thoroughbred student of ancient history, familiar with every department of natural science, not ignorant of the principles on which rests the science of law, government and political economy, and well read in the elements which lie at the basis of the ancient and modern civilizations.

This will seem to some young men, in a hurry to enter the pulpit, a large demand upon their labor and patience; but after all, this is the temper of the times. "Traditions and reverence for 'the man of God,' have resolutely protected many a one in the pulpit, who would have fallen flat on the platform or at the bar. But the day of this divine interference and defence is passing. Special talents and not the garb, other things being equal, are now to win as elsewhere, so in the pulpit. The mere *garb* has lost its charm. The clerical office must henceforth stand upon real merit." Mr. Townsend, in saying this, simply gives expression to the fast-growing convictions of those who compose most of our congregations, especially the younger portion, among whom so largely now we find that culture which is the fruit of a collegiate or academic training, and which justly demands a corresponding culture in the pulpit. And that pulpit which fails to meet this demand surely surrenders its power and influence, and cultivated minds turn elsewhere for instruction and guidance.

But it is not only in a general literary way that the people are rapidly passing beyond the old standard of demand and expectation from the pulpit, but even in the matter of Biblical study and interpretation; for, as our author says, "in knowledge of the Bible and its truths there are those in the pews who are silently advancing beyond those in the pulpit" — or perhaps, more exactly, beyond *some* of those in the pulpit.

Beside the matter of a higher education for the minister, there are in the book many other things respecting preaching and sermons and pastoral labor, and the duties and responsibilities of the people, which should receive attention from preachers who wish to do justice to their hearers, and from congregations wishing to help their pastors in their endeavors after usefulness and success.

2. Behind the Bars — or Life in an Insane Asylum. Lee & Shepard. $2.00.

A much needed book, which ought to have been written long ago; for the outrages committed in Asylums for the Insane are not all confined to the old world, nor are the infamous agencies by which people of sound mind are forced into these institutions. It is evident that this work is written by one who has suffered directly, or through the sufferings of others, from the abuses described in its pages. It will

be read with painful interest by those who have seen friends or acquaintances or relations put Behind the Bars because it was convenient to have them out of the way; or because an affinity had been found in some spiritual circle, or some similar iniquity was to be covered up; or because some expectant heirs were in haste to manage the property, and imprisonment in an insane asylum might hasten the death they were tired of waiting for; or because, owing to some other disease or infirmity, the care of them had become irksome, and it was not difficult, for a consideration, to obtain a physician's certificate for their removal.

And the story of life in these institutions ought to be written out; for friends, who in good faith take the really insane to these asylums, do not know what kind of a life they are taking them to. Of course every one knows how difficult it is to make out a case of abuse, for the victims cannot be believed, all their solemn asservations being regarded as only just proofs of their insanity; and relatives and friends are assured that their visits and interviews are sure to increase the paroxysms and retard the cure; and employes, to whom, indeed, these abuses are sometimes chargeable, know well enough, when the fault is not their own, that their place depends on their silence.

Of course, these statement are not of universal application. There are, as we personally know, honorable exceptions. But after all that can be said in reply to this book — whose statements find abundant confirmation in certain articles which appeared in the *Atlantic* two or three years ago — we say to all, unless your safety is endangered, never send one you love to a private or a public insane asylum.

The volume should have titles to the chapters, or a table of contents, or an index of subjects, or something to guide one in haste in finding a particular passage or statement.

3. Culture and Religion in some of their Relations. By J. C. Sharp, Principal of the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard.

This is a timely book, full of clear, sound thought, presented in an easy and attractive style. It is admirably addressed to students, and will be read with interest by all honest, religious thinkers who may give their attention to it. The author is well qualified for the work he undertakes, which is to show that there can be no true and complete culture unless the religious has rule and supremacy in the mind and affections. The statement of Mr. Huxley's failure to recognize "that there is an open path between the soul and God," is well made; and the chapters on "Hindrances to Spiritual Growth" and "The Combination of Religion and Culture," are full of practical suggestions. The author's inability to find light in view of the problem of evil as connected with the human will, is one of the many evidences of the unsatisfactory nature of all theology that is not based on the universalism of the New Testament. That "Scripture affords no solution of this great perplexity," is untrue. The Scriptures are given us that we through their testimony may have hope in that Paternal Love

which is to subdue all opposing wills to its own. Notwithstanding this defect, as we regard it, in the author's theology, we most heartily welcome his book, and commend it all who may read this notice of it.

J. G. A.

4. Pink and White Tyranny. By Mrs. H. B. Stowe. Boston. Roberts Brothers. 12 mo. $1.50.

It is seldom that we can say of a work of fiction what we are glad to say of this — that it is useful, much needed, noble in purpose, fiction only in form but history in fact, full of wisdom, sharply rebuking the folly and wickedness of fashion, its moral and religious lessons made as attractive as they are impressive — in a word, a book which ought to be read by men and women of every rank and condition; and being read, and heeded, would do a work second only in importance to "Uncle Tom's Cabin." In noticing and cordially commending such a book as this, we do not go beyond the legitimate aims of the *Quarterly;* for we feel that it is simply commending a praiseworthy and successful attempt to honor true morality and piety, to bring into light the temptations and dangers of a fashionable life, to rebuke the growing disposition to think and speak lightly of the ties and obligations of marriage and the sanctities of domestic life, to show the need of a higher moral element in the education of our young women; or, to put it all into one phrase, to enforce the doctrine that Christian principle should be the supreme guide of thought, feeling and action.

We have not much room for extracts, but we cannot refuse place to the following on a subject so much debated, talked and written about, and yet so little understood in its most important bearing on woman and her offspring:

"It has been very surprising to us to see in these our times that some people, who really at heart have the interest of women upon their minds, have been so short-sighted and reckless as to clamor for an easy dissolution of the marriage contract, as a means of righting their wrongs. Is it possible that they do not see that this is a liberty which, once granted, would always tell against the weaker sex? If the woman who finds that she has made a mistake, and married a man unkind or uncongenial, may, on the discovery of it, leave him, and seek her fortune with another, so also may a man. And what will become of women like Lillie, when the first gilding begins to wear off, if the men who have taken them shall be at liberty to cast them off and seek others? Have we not enough now of miserable, broken-winged butterflies, that sink down, down, down into the mud of the street? But are women-reformers going to clamor for having every woman turned out helpless, when the man who has married her, and made her a mother, discovers that she has not the power to interest him, and to help his higher spiritual development? It is because woman is helpless and weak, and because Christ was her great Protector, that he made the law of marriage irrevocable: 'Whosoever putteth away his wife causeth her to commit adultery.' If the sacredness of the marriage contract did not hold, if the Church and all good men and all good women did not uphold it with their might and main, it is easy to see where the career of many women like Lillie would end."

5. Reindeer, Dogs and Snow-Shoes. A Journal of Siberian Travel and Explorations made in the years 1865–6–7. By Richard I. Bush, late of the Russo-American Telegraph Expedition. With Illustrations. Harper & Brothers. 8 vo. $3.00.

A book whose title does not do justice to the pleasing, informing and really valuable matter filling its pages. It is a fresh contribution

toward the history of the earth and the human race; being not only a record of travel and adventure, and a repository of important facts for science, geography and natural history, but also a picture of life, manners, customs, religions and superstitions among tribes of men of whom hitherto almost nothing has been known. A large portion of the region traversed has never before been explored by civilized man, and therefore a special interest and importance attach to all the author has to communicate respecting the countries and the people visited.

If some of the tribes mentioned began as savages, some thousands of years ago, we can only say that they have not gained much in the interval. The doctrine of necessary development and progress, obedient to the law of human nature, without divine assistance of any sort, gets very little illustration or encouragement from the present condition of these miserable races. On the other hand, if their ancestors, far back toward the beginning of the world, began with all the advantages of revelation and civilization given of God, this wretched degradation, social and religious, only shows how far into the depths man may sink when left to the guidance of that reason so glorified in these days as sufficient for all human needs and growth to perfection.

The following example of the domestic customs of the *Gilacks*, a superstitious pagan people, will illustrate one phase of natural growth. Compare it with the conduct of the male lion under similar circumcumstances:

"During parturition, whether in winter or summer, the unfortunate mother is ejected from her habitation — thrust out of doors, exposed to the inclemency of the weather, there to provide for herself as best she may, solitary and ignored, until a certain period shall have elapsed. During this time every possible assistance is denied her, it being considered almost criminal to lend her the slightest attention, and, as a natural consequence, death often ensues."

These Gilacks burn the bodies of their dead, and then erect a wooden house or tomb over the ashes. At death, the soul is supposed to take up its abode in the favorite dog of the deceased, where it remains until released from its confinement by the death of the animal. To facilitate its escape, it has become customary to sacrifice the dog at the tomb of its master, the creature being first fattened for the occasion.

The following will show that even where there is a revelation, if it be not heeded, if the wisdom of this world which is earthly, sensual, devilish, is allowed to displace the wisdom from above, any depth of superstition and vileness is possible. The author is describing a Russian priest, who is a drunkard and a gambler, and whom he declares, unfairly, it is to be hoped, a representative of his class. This priest was gambling with the governor, and tells the author how he won a hundred roubles:

"At the commencement of the game, the priest had drawn a hideous picture of his Satanic Majesty on the lower side of the paper upon which the record of the game was kept, and, from superstitious motives, had placed that side of the paper next the ispravnik (governor), believing that it would cause him ill luck. As the game progressed, contrary to his expectations, the ispravnik won so steadily that the priest be-

est in that course. Few words will be necessary with good dispositions on your part. Adore God. Reverence and cherish your parents. Love your neighbor as yourself, and your country more than yourself. Be just. Be true. Murmur not at the ways of Providence. So shall the life into which you have entered be the portal to one of eternal and ineffable bliss. And if to the dead it is permitted to care for the things of this world, every action of your life will be under my regard. Farewell."

It is beautiful to learn of the friendship, and almost school-boy tenderness, which existed to the last between this venerable man and his fellow Presidents, Adams and Madison — never disturbed for a momoment by any difference of opinion on measures in politics or the conduct of national affairs. Writing to Mrs. Adams in 1817, he says, speaking of the last twenty years preceding:

"But those twenty years! Alas! where are they? With those beyond the flood. Our next meeting must then be in the country to which they have flown — a country for us not now very distant. For this journey we shall need neither gold nor silver in our purse, nor scrip, nor coats, nor staves. Nor is the provision for it more easy than the preparation has been kind. Nothing proves more than this that the Being who presides over the world is essentially benevolent — stealing from us, one by one, the faculties of enjoyment, searing our sensibilities, leading us, like the horse in his mill, round and round the beaten circle, until, fatigued with this leaden iteration, we ask our own *conge*."

It is painful to read the record of the pecuniary embarrassments of his last years, the result of his long and unselfish devotion to his country; and of his pathetic application to the Virginia legislature for its help to prevent his being driven into the world in his then old age, houseless and homeless. Happily he died unconscious that the sale of his property would fail to pay his debts; that his beautiful home, Monticello, the pride and joy of his heart, would pass into the hands of strangers, and his "dear and beloved daughter," penniless and almost heart-broken, see its doors closed upon her forever! All honor to South Carolina and Lousiana, which, on learning the destitute condition of Mrs. Randolph, voted and sent her ten thousand dollars each; and shame to Virginia, which looked on, talked, and did nothing.

8. Thomas Chalmers. A Biographical Study. By James Dodds. Carlton & Lanahan. $1.25

Those who have only heard of Chalmers as a marvel of pulpit oratory, or been charmed with the magnificent eloquence of his "Astronomical Sermons," will learn from this biographical sketch that he is eminent in other respects, and a man of remarkable powers as an organizer and financier. His leadership and labors in the great secession, and upbuildining of the "Free Church of Scotland," were the chief agencies in securing victory and permanent success. And the most interesting and instructive portion of the book is that which describes the secession, organization and financial triumph of the new church. The picture is admirably drawn, and is an eloquent and unanswerable reply to the sneers of those who declare that independence, conscience, and loyalty to God and Truth have died out from the

Church. The story of the "Free Church," in connection with its eloquent leader, should be read as the antidote to the "Bondage of the Pulpit" in *Scribner's Monthly*. The following paragraph refers to the famous Astronomical Sermons:

"The success was as unexpected as it was unprecedented. Nobody could be more amazed than himself and his publishers. Instead of a fair Glasgow sale, on which they had counted, the work was flying on the wings of the wind to every part of Scotland and England. It came out side by side with the 'Tales of my Landlord,' and side by side it kept — a volume of sermons running neck to neck with the magnificent 'Waverly Novels!' It passed through nine editions in one year, and 20,000 volumes were in circulation; they were the rage of the season."

9. The Federal Government: Its Officers and their Duties. By Ransom H. Gillet. Woolworth, Ainsworth & Co. New York and Chicago. 1871. 12 mo. 440 pp.

The object of this volume is pretty clearly indicated by its title. To such persons as desire a knowledge of our national government, its constitution, organization, various officers and their duties — and the number of such persons should be limited only to the intelligent citizens of the United States — the work before us must be most acceptable. Its value, of course, must depend very much on the qualifications of the author, his acquaintance with the various subjects upon which he treats, and his skill in exhibiting the facts with which he deals. Mr. Gillet seems to come to his work well prepared for it.

After completing his professional education, he was soon engaged in the political affairs of his native State of New York, and made himself familiar with its constitution and laws. Ere long he entered Congress as Representative of St. Lawrence Co. More recently he was made Register and Solicitor of the United States Treasury Department, Solicitor for the United States in the Court of Claims, etc. etc. "A long practice," he says, "in the higher national courts, and over twenty years' service in Congress and in various important official positions in the Executive Departments, have rendered me comparatively familiar with most matters pertaining to the federal government." He further tells us that he has neglected no opportunity of acquiring the desired knowledge, and having himself felt the need of such a volume, and being urged, since his retirement to prepare such a work, he now offers it to the public, in the hope that it may afford such information as many people desire, and prove generally useful.

The work is not intended to give minute information to all who hold office. Its object is to enable his readers to understand the structure of the government, what officers are employed in its practical operation, and their general duties.

Besides this useful information the volume contains a great amount of interesting and important facts, as the names of our Presidents and Vice-Presidents, the time they took their oath of office, the various Secretaries of the Departments, Judges of the Supreme Court, the public debt every year, from the organization of the government, etc. etc.

Altogether this seems to be a volume which is worthy of entire confidence, and deserves a place in every public and private library.

T. J. S.

10. The Model Prayer. A Course of Lectures on the Lord's Prayer, By George Baldwin, D. D. Lee & Shepard. $1.25.

A beautiful volume on a subject ever interesting to the devout Christian. Dr. Baldwin's treatment, though tinged with the specialties of his creed, is instructive and well fitted to inspire the soul with reverent affection and trust toward God. There is a remarkably happy blending of criticism, history, illustrative incident, preceptive teaching, and devotional feeling, in his unfolding of the several petitions of the prayer. We have been particularly pleased with what he says of the "argument" — "for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory." It reminds us of a sermon of our own on these words preached many years ago. It *is* an argument — forgive our sins, keep us from temptation, deliver us from evil, *for* in all this *thy* kingdom is promoted, enlarged; and thou hast the *power* to do this — not physical, but moral and spiritual power; and why not then do it, since, when done, *thine* is the *glory* forever — therefore — "Amen" — be it so.

11. Fragments of Science for Unscientific People: A Series of Detached Essays, Lectures and Reviews. By John Tyndall, LL. D., F. R. S. D. Appleton & Co. $2.00.

The title describes the book — a series of Essays on scientific questions put in a form to interest and instruct the multitude, those not familiar with the dialect and formulas of science. Several of them, when first published in England, deservedly attracted universal attention, learned and unlearned being equally lavish in commendation of their subject-matter and style, the last remarkable alike for its finish and crystal clearness. Still, there are features in several of the papers which we do not quite like; especially the attempt to enthrone science above Revelation and Theology, and to show that there can be, or at least that so far there has been, nothing beyond the facts of science, nothing supernatural in the sense of miracle.

It is the fault of Prof. Tyndall and his class that they assume, perhaps unconsciously, that they have demonstrated all the possibilities of mind as well as matter, and discovered all the methods in which spirit, even the Spirit Almighty, can act on matter, whether of the human body or of the physical universe. They have yet to learn the important truth that Science deals only with natural phenomena, not with the facts or possibilities of spirit; and that while Religion cannot be allowed to interfere with a chemical experiment, or decide on the tests of the spectrum analysis, on the other hand it has a spiritual domain of its own into which Science cannot be allowed to bring its crucible or microscope, and on the authority of these to determine the nature and force of spirit, to set limits to the power of the Infinite God, or catalogue the methods in which only he can be allowed to produce a given result.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building

form 410

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building

form 410